ROYAL COMMISSION ON CONGESTION IN IRELAND.

APPENDIX

TO THE

ELEVENTH REPORT.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

(TAKEN IN LONDON, 22ND TO 24TH JANUARY, 1908).

AND

DOCUMENTS RELATING THERETO.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.

DUBLIN
PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY ALEXANDER THOM & CO. (LIMITED), ABBEY STREET.

And to be purchased either directly or through any Bookseller from
E. PONSONBY, 116, Grafton-street, Dublin; or
WYMAN and SONS, Limited, Fetter-lane, E.C.; and
32, Abingdon-street, Westminster, S.W.; or
OLIVER and BOYD, Tweeddale-court, Edinburgh.

1908.

[Cd. 4089.] Price 1s. 2d.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

SALE OF GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS.

The undermentioned Firms have been appointed sole Agents for the sale of Government Publications, including Parliamentary Reports and Papers, Acts of Parliament, Record Office Publications, &c., &c. (with the undermentioned exceptions), and all such works can be purchased from them either directly or through retail booksellers, who are entitled to a discount of 25 per cent. from the published prices:—

IN ENGLAND.—MESSRS. WYMAN AND SONS, LTD., Fetter lane, E.C.

IN SCOTLAND.—MESSRS. OLIVER AND BOYD, Tweeddale Court, Edinburgh.

IN IRELAND.—MR. E. PONSONBY, 116 Grafton-street, Dublin.

Hydrographical Publications of the Admiralty are sold by Mr. J. D. Potter, 145, Minories, E.C.

Patent Office Publications are sold at the Patent Office. (Classified Abridgments of Patent Specifications are sold also by Wyman & Sons, Ltd.)

The Publications of the ORDNANCE SURVEY and of the GEOLOGICAL SURVEY can be purchased from Agents in most of the chief towns in the United Kingdom, through any Bookseller, or from the Director General of the Ordnance Survey, Southampton, or in the case of Ireland, from the Superintendent, Ordnance Survey, Dublin. In addition, Small Scale Maps, &c., as a rule, procurable at Railway Bookstalls in England and Wales.

The Journal of the Board of Agriculture is published monthly by the Board, at 4, Whitehall place, S.W. Prior to April 1907, it was published by Messrs. Knighton & Co., Ltd., 3, Wellington street, Strand, W.C. Price 4d.

The following is a list of some of the more important Parliamentary and Official Publications recently issued:—

Statutes.—

Public General Acts, 1907. In separate chapters, at varying prices.

Local and Personal Acts, 1907. 3d. per 1 pp.

Army Act—Consolidation—including amendments to 1907. [illegible]

Public General Session 1907. With Index, Tables, &c. Cloth. [illegible]

Index to Local and Personal Acts, 1801–1899. [illegible]

Index to Local and Personal Acts, 1900–1907. Each year may be purchased separately.

Second Revised Edition, 1235–1886. XVI. Vols. 7s. 6d. [illegible]

Statutes in Force: Chronological Table and Index of. 3rd Edition. To the end of the Session 7 Edward VII. (1907). 2 vols. 10s. [illegible]

Statutory Rules and Orders other than those of a Local, Personal, or Temporary Character. With a List of Statutory Orders of a Local Character arranged in classes, an Appendix of certain Orders in Council, &c., and an Index. Issue in 1890 to 1907. 10s. [illegible]

Statutory Rules and Orders issued. Statutory Rules and Orders, other than those of a Local, Personal, or Temporary Character, [illegible] December 31, 1906. Vols. I. to XIII. 10s. [illegible]

Statutory Rules and Orders [illegible] 31st December, 1906. Index to [illegible]

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS [illegible] HOUSE OF COMMONS [illegible] issued. 1d. per 8 pp.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS [illegible] HOUSE OF LORDS as issued. 1d. per 4 pp.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS. [illegible] Royal Commissioners. In course of issue.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS. Evidence in separate parts. Coral's Mines, Irish Railways, Shipping Rings.

[illegible] Tuberculosis Question. [illegible]

[illegible] Statistics, 1905–6. [illegible]

[illegible] Report, Evidence, &c. [illegible]

[illegible] Report, Evidence, &c. [illegible]

[illegible] Operation of the Laws. [illegible]

[illegible] Report, Evidence, &c. [illegible]

[illegible] Report, Evidence, &c. [illegible]

[illegible] Report, Evidence, &c. [illegible]

MINES [illegible] and the Isle of Man. List of, for 1906. [illegible]

[illegible] and the Isle of Man. List of, for 1906. [illegible]

[illegible] Corrected to 31st December, 1906.

Trade and Commerce, &c.—

[illegible] Quantities and the Declared Value of the Articles. Monthly.

[illegible] with information relative to population and general condition.

[illegible] Representatives in Foreign Countries and Reports on Subjects of Commercial and Co[illegible]

[illegible] Retail Prices, Rates of Wages, &c.

[illegible] British Empire, 1892–1906.

[illegible] United Kingdom. Years 1892–1906.

[illegible] Years 1892–1906.

[illegible] British India. Years 1896–1897 to 1905–1906.

[illegible] United Kingdom, 1906. Vols. I., II., and III.

[illegible] 11th Abstract, 1906–6.

[illegible] Memoranda, Tables, and [illegible]

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

ROYAL COMMISSION ON CONGESTION IN IRELAND.

APPENDIX

TO THE

ELEVENTH REPORT.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

(TAKEN IN LONDON, 22ND TO 24TH JANUARY, 1908),

AND

DOCUMENTS RELATING THERETO.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.

DUBLIN:
PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY ALEXANDER THOM & CO. (LIMITED), ABBEY-STREET.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
E. PONSONBY, 116, Grafton-street, Dublin; or
WYMAN and SONS, Limited, Fetter-lane, E.C., and
32, Abingdon-street, Westminster, S.W.; or
OLIVER and BOYD, Tweeddale-court, Edinburgh.

1908.

[Cd. 4089.] *Price* 1*s*. 2*d*.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
List of Members of the Commission,	iii
Terms of Reference,	iii
List of Witnesses,	iv
Digest of Evidence,	v
Minutes of Evidence,	1
Index to Appendices,	40
Appendices	42

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

ROYAL COMMISSION ON CONGESTION IN IRELAND.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION.

The Right Hon. The Earl of Dudley, G.C V.O. (Chairman)

The Right Hon Sir A. P. MacDonnell, G.C.S I.

The Right Hon. Sir John C. R. Colomb, K.C.M.G.

The Right Hon. Sir Francis Mowatt, G.C.B.

The Most Rev. Patrick O'Donnell, D.D., Lord Bishop of Raphoe.

John Annan Bryce, Esq., M.P.

Walter Kavanagh, Esq., M.P., D.L.

Conor O'Kelly, Esq., M.P

Angus Sutherland, Esq., Chairman of the Fishery Board for Scotland

Secretary—

Walter Callan, Esq.

TERMS OF REFERENCE.

"To inquire into and report upon the operations of the Acts dealing with Congestion in Ireland, the working of the Congested Districts Board, and the Land Commission under these Acts, and the relations of the Board with the Land Commission and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; what areas (if any) outside the districts now scheduled as congested, require to be dealt with as congested; what lands are most conveniently situated for the relief of congestion; what changes in law or administration are needed for dealing with the problem of congestion as a whole, for facilitating the migration of the surplus population from congested areas to other lands, and generally for bettering the condition of the people inhabiting congested areas."

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

WITNESSES.

	Page of Digest.	Page of Evidence.
DORAN, Mr. Henry, ...	v.	1
MITCHELL, Mr. F. W. D., . .	x.	36

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

DIGEST OF EVIDENCE.

DORAN, Mr. HENRY.

See pp. 1-36.

CLASSIFICATION OF ESTATES BOUGHT BY THE BOARD UNDER ACT OF 1903, WHICH HAD BEEN TREATED AND PREPARED FOR SALE—ACCORDING TO AMOUNT OF LOSS ON IMPROVEMENTS.

Particulars had been prepared of the actual loss incurred by the Board in treating estates bought under the Act of 1903, 59394.—These estates were classified as follows:—Class A.—Poor tenanted estates on some of which there was a small proportion of untenanted land available for migration and enlargement of holdings; Class B.—Very poor tenanted estates on which there was practically no agricultural land available for these purposes; Class C.—Estates comprised wholly or mainly of untenanted land used chiefly for migration; the total purchase price of A., B., and C. was £317,639, the total expenditure on improvements £81,249, and the total net loss £41,152, 59561.—The total poor law valuation £12,457, and the total area 53,627 acres, of which 10,558 acres were untenanted, and 43,096 acres were tenanted, 59394-8, 59400-2, 59561, 59640, 59828.—Class A., represented by the Dillon and De Freyne Estates, comprised 76·1 of the gross purchase money, and though the improvement had been substantial, the percentage of loss had only been 9·4 of the cost price of the estates, 59561.—Class B., represented by the Carna, Erris, and Connemara Estates, and those about Mallaranny, comprised 15·6 per cent. of the gross purchase money; the only improvements effected had been improvement of dwellings, re-arrangement of holdings, and the making of roads and drains; the number of economic holdings had not been materially increased, 59562.—Improvements had not been considered sufficiently directly reproductive for any appreciable portion of the outlay to be charged to the sale prices of holdings, so that the percentage of loss had been 21·6 per cent. of the cost price of the estates, 59572.—Class C. comprised only 8·3 per cent. of the gross purchase money; its total area was 3,000 acres of grass land, and the loss 28·8 per cent., 59562, 59572.—The average loss on A., B., and C. together was 12·9 per cent., 59577, 59708, 59764, 59810, 59837, 59941, 59948.

TYPICAL CHARACTER OF ESTATES CLASSIFIED.

Improvements had been effected as economically as was consistent with efficiency, and as the above were average estates, the result of the operations, though not an absolute guide, should afford the safest available information on which to estimate the loss likely to be involved in the treatment of similar properties, 59405, 59574, 59644, 59655, 59678, 59681, 59834, 59943, 59945.

EFFECT WHICH THE GRANTING OF COMPULSORY POWERS WOULD HAVE ON PERCENTAGE OF LOSS.

It was, however, most important to analyse the character of the above estates; 75 per cent. consisted of properties needing improvement, but responding to treatment like the Dillon Estate. The Board had done their best for A, but sufficient relief had not been given. They had not been able to acquire the lands best suited for migration purposes, and consequently very few people had migrated. A number of Dillon Estate tenants would go if lands could be acquired near at hand. Granted compulsory powers, greater improvements could be effected in future, and the 9 per cent. loss on A would be increased, 59575-91, 59705, 59837, 59843-4.—It was not likely that in practice all the tenants of an estate could be provided with economic holdings. The arrangements on Colonel Smith's estate in Erris and on the Madden Estate had approached the ideal, and the loss had

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

been 25·4 and 24 per cent. respectively, 79704-8.—The Dillon Estate had, owing to favourable circumstances, been treated without loss, which fact had reduced the average percentage of loss to 6 per cent. If the Dillon Estate had to be bought to-day, improvements like those effected would, by themselves, mean a loss of 10 per cent., and this would be at least doubled if really satisfactory treatment were given. This would be the case on all such estates unless they happened to contain a large area of grass land, 59592-8, 59672-6, 59696-9.

LOW PERCENTAGE OF LOSS WHEN UNTENANTED LAND WAS IN THE AMBIT OF THE ESTATE.

The Armstrong Estate was a fair illustration of the result of operations in favourable circumstances. Few new houses had been required, and the untenanted land, though not near the tenanted, had been within the ambit of the estate. Had it been at any distance the actual net loss of 15 per cent. would have been greatly increased, perhaps doubled. The land might have cost even less—the increased expenditure would have been on building, fencing, and road-making. Advances on the sale price of holdings had been taken into account when estimating the 15 per cent. loss, but not loans, 59598-615.—Assuming what was unlikely—that fifty families would have migrated, the net loss would have been at least £100 per family, although a certain proportion of the expenditure would have been put on the annuity, 59598-619.

PROPORTION OF B ESTATES WHICH SHOULD BE BOUGHT, AND TREATMENT WHICH SHOULD BE GIVEN.

If a million's worth of land were bought annually, it would not be advisable to buy more than 10 per cent. of the B class; the area of these estates was not indicated by the percentage, *e.g.*, the Berridge Estate, though very large, was not worth much; congestion on these properties could not be much relieved by migration; the majority were remote from grass areas, and a considerable number of occupiers objected to migration, and in any case were quite unfit for it at present; B estates were the worst class, and would probably remain bad no matter what the Board did for them; for this reason the Board had rather avoided the purchase of B in remote districts, 59822-4, 59826, 59828, 59835, 59837-41, 59848-9, 59961.—The standard of comfort of one-half the population of the congested districts could only be appreciably raised by the provision of industrial employment, 59827.—All maritime districts were of Class B, and the development of fishing would keep these. Even if this could not be done to a satisfactory extent, the conditions of life of the population could be much ameliorated, 59827.—Few would probably argue that emigration should be facilitated (though a large number of people would be willing to go), but if the peasants were given decent homes with turbary for fuel, grazing for a couple of cows, and space for fowls, they would, though poor, lead good and happy lives, and would be a valuable asset to Ireland if she could employ them as labourers; if not they would be useful as migratory labourers, 59849-50.—In this last case the conditions under which they travelled and their housing in England should be supervised, 59852.—Lands should be striped and money freely spent on improving houses, as nothing seemed to have a more elevating effect on the habits of a peasant's family than the possession of a good house and surroundings, 59828.—The Board only put up new houses for the people they moved in striping, the peasants themselves building four times as many houses with grants given under the Houses Improvements Scheme and the Parish Committee Schemes, 59842.—

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

Smaller sums were given for substantial improvements to existing houses, carried out in accordance with the Board's specifications, and sometimes a sum was added to the sale price of the holding and repaid in the annuity; buying an estate to stripe, improve, and re-sell to the tenants would by no means make future migration more difficult; the vacated holdings could easily be amalgamated with the adjoining striped holdings; in such cases the better house was always chosen for retention, 59842-5, 59851-2.

ADVANTAGES OF INCREASED MIGRATION; COST TO BE BORNE BY THE STATE, PROPOSED.

The more migration work done by the Board the more radical and effective was their treatment; the country really received good value for the expenditure involved as compared with the loss entailed by treating estates without substantially improving them. A special grant should be given by the State to meet the loss on increased migration; at present the only portion of the Board's funds not derived from Irish sources was the annual Parliamentary Grant of £20,000, 59765-8.

PURCHASE OF ONE-THIRD UNTENANTED LAND PROPOSED; INCREASED LOSS WHICH WOULD BE ENTAILED.

Witness recommended that Class C should in future comprise one-third of the estates purchased, 59632.—Then the loss, calculated in the same proportion as it had actually been on this class, would, roughly speaking, raise the loss on the entire group of estates from 12·9 to 17·2 per cent., because untenanted land cost most to try and prepare for migrants, 59632.—If congestion were only to be relieved by enlargement of holdings, a large amount of grass land should have to be bought in order to assist the worst estates, 59645, 59648-50, 59688-92, 59705, 59781.—C was only a loss, because it was needed for A and B, and as a matter of account the actual loss could be debited to the estates benefited, 59640-4.—Class C should be used chiefly for the amelioration of A, as more satisfactory results would be obtained there than in B, 59835-7, 59846-7.

COST OF MIGRATION; CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING QUESTION OF FUTURE LOSS.

The tenants in these groups had all paid at least two years' full rent, and the untenanted land had been sold at the average price paid by the Board, viz., twenty-seven years' purchase of the estimated annual value, or 29·5 years' purchase of the poor-law valuation, 59692, 59798.—This last was misleading as a standard of value, because a bog valued at 3*d* might be bought cheap at £4 per acre if situated near a densely populated district. If the Board were to charge the same interest as the Estates Commissioners, and the revenue of the land while on hands were substantially reduced, the 17·2 per cent. loss would be increased in proportion, 59796-804, 59856-9, 60026-7.—The goodwill of his old holding was credited to a migrant in the price of his new holding, he paying the twenty-seven years purchase only for the extra amount of land acquired *plus* something for the new buildings erected. (The minimum desirable accommodation for a family cost £110, the annual value of the new land being seldom less than £15. This would, roughly, represent a capital sum of £40, while the Board, having spent, say, £120 on buildings, would lose £80 on the transaction). The occupation interest of the vacated holding would be charged to the incoming tenant *plus* the fee-simple. If the house was not of much value, little or nothing was allowed for it. A bad house was knocked down, but if fairly good, the new occupier paid a separate rent for it, while his old house was, if necessary, demolished, 59620-32, 59769-73.—Though migration had before entailed an average loss of only 25 or 26 per cent., it was not likely in future to be less than 30 per cent. The cost price at twenty-seven years of the estimated fair value of a £15 holding was £405. The cost of buildings, as the Board knew by experience, had risen to £130, that of roads to £20, and of fences to £20 owing to scarcity of labour, making the total cost £575. Calculating the sale price on an annuity of 85 per cent. of the £15 annual value, *i.e.*, £12 16s., the total cost was £294, entailing a loss of £181. By deducting the average value of the occupation interest of the vacated holding—viz., £35—the loss was reduced to £146, and still further to £94, or 23·2 per cent., if a £2 rent were paid for buildings, making the gross fair rent £17, 59761-4, 59768, 59781, 59948-9, 59968, 60003.—The annuity of a migrant's holding should not exceed 85 per cent. of the fair letting value, including buildings, and it would be better if these could be excluded. This could not be done without increased loss, unless bigger men would migrate. The larger the occupation interest of the vacated holding, the smaller the loss involved. Moreover small surrendered holdings allowed but a small enlargement of adjacent holdings. It was, however, doubtful, judging by recent experience, if bigger men would migrate, and there were not many of them in Class A. The acquisition of an adequate amount of grass land near the estate treated would lessen the difficulty, but the effect of the migration of larger men would probably not counterbalance the loss entailed by the increased cost of labour, 59710, 59764, 59768, 59965-72.

INCREASED LOSS TO BE ANTICIPATED IF TOO HIGH A PRICE WERE PAID FOR THE OCCUPATION INTEREST IN UNTENANTED LAND.

It seemed likely that the Board would seek to acquire a far larger proportion of non-residential tenanted holdings than hitherto; if they had to pay more for these than for land in the owner's possession they would not be able to sell the holdings created at annuities not exceeding the 85 per cent. of the fair rent without incurring a far larger loss than the 30 per cent. of the cost price of the land alone of the migrant's holding; there seemed no real reason why a larger price should be paid for land jointly owned by two persons (tenant and landlord) than for land occupied by one, 59710.—The land was valued on an estimate of the revenue it was capable of yielding when properly managed, and the buildings were valued separately, the number of owners had nothing to do with the question, 59715-6.—Untenanted land sometimes fetched an excessive price in the open market when the State provided money for the purchase of the fee-simple; otherwise not; in any case a prudent buyer would have regard to the instability of a competitive rental; grazing rents in Mayo and Roscommon had fallen considerably, so that the undivided interest was not so valuable as might appear, 59710-41, 59856-7, 60026-7.

EXPENSES WHICH SHOULD BE CHARGED TO ADMINISTRATION.

It should be pointed out that the loss on estates bought under the Act of 1903 included cost of surveyors, paymasters, and clerks of works. The Estates Commissioners charged all such expenses, except the wages of gangers, to administration, to be included in the vote for the Land Commission, and the Board should do likewise, 59859-61.

REDUCTION IN PERCENTAGE OF LOSS IF BOARD'S AREA OF OPERATIONS WERE TO INCLUDE THE WHOLE OF THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS COUNTIES.

The Board, acting on a right principle, had bought only estates needing treatment. Probably about one-fourth of the land in Connaught—*i.e.*, estates and sections of estates—could be passed for direct sale, and if these were included in the area of the Board's operations the percentage of loss would be reduced by perhaps one-fourth; also the proportions of A, B, and C would be changed, 59403-9, 59412, 59636, 59644-68, 59683 59861, 59863, 59942, 59946-7.—The remaining three-fourths did not include any estates on the verge of being economic, though there were some in Class A which had not needed much treatment—*e.g.*, the Colles-Sandes Estate, costing £71,000, on which the loss had only been 2·8 per cent. If, which was unlikely, there should prove to

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

be a larger proportion of such estates in A the percentage of loss on the entire would be reduced. This would, however, be counterbalanced to some extent by the increased expenditure on estates like Lord Dillon's, 59677-82, 59684-5, 59947.

PROPORTION IN WHICH THE THREE CLASSES OF ESTATES SHOULD BE BOUGHT IF THE BOARD WERE TO DEAL WITH £1,000,000 WORTH OF LAND ANNUALLY.

If the Board dealt yearly with £1,000,000 worth of land, of which one-third were of C Class and one-tenth of B Class, the loss on the two, counted as 30 and 20 per cent. respectively, would be £120,000; if the total loss were limited to this sum 75 per cent. of A, tenanted estates, would have to be dealt with without any loss. The limit, however, should be at least 15 per cent. to allow for a loss of 5 or 6 per cent. on A. This last figure had been brought down from 9 per cent. because if the whole county were dealt with there would be a larger proportion of estates of better quality in A than was shown in the schedule, 59819-21, 59942-3, 59947.—In practice it would not be possible to preserve the exact proportions of A. B, C, though if, as seemed probable, as much as one-third of C could not be acquired, more of B could be bought, and in that way the loss on the gross output kept within a fixed average. This, however, was uncertain, for the Board should in future buy blocks of estates, and there might be an excess of A over B or of C over the others. If there were at any time an accumulation of B the purchase of A and C would have to cease for a while, and the output would be less. There should not be more than £1,000,000 worth of C in hand at any time. If the annual grant to be made to the Board were based on an average net loss it would be necessary to allow them a reasonable discretion in the selection and grouping of estates, so as to keep the total of the varying losses within the estimate. It would be objectionable to fix the grant on a varying percentage of loss; it would be preferable to have an annual grant fixed by a new Act placed at their disposal to be applied at their discretion, subject to the general understanding that they would sell annually about £1,000,000 worth of estates, 59705, 59819, 59829-32, 59855, 59861, 59883-91.—The Commission should make it perfectly clear in their recommendation that very variable losses were necessarily incurred in dealing with different classes of estates and that the percentage named by them was the average for all classes, so as to prevent people from clamouring for the average percentage of loss in the treatment of each estate, 59889-93.

POWER FOR THE BOARD TO EXCLUDE ESTATES OR PORTIONS OF ESTATES NOT REQUIRING TREATMENT

It should rest with the Board to exclude from purchase estates or portions of estates which could be sold without special treatment, 59819, 59855.—They would have any large property offered them inspected, and if a substantial portion either did not need or was incapable of improvement, it should be certified as a separate estate to be sold direct (as its purchase by the Board would lead to great dissatisfaction, and hamper the work of reform on other properties), 59412-3, 59415.—Landlords and tenants would probably easily come to terms over the good part of the estate when they understood the reason for splitting up the property. Tenants would not wish their holdings to be bought by the Board and held for a couple of years when no money would be spent on them eventually, 59146, 59438.—In the few cases where landlords and tenants had come to terms before approaching the Board the difficulty of dealing with estates had been increased. There was a general desire amongst West of Ireland landlords to do it, and tenants were so anxious for the Board to buy and improve that they agreed to give too high a price. The landlord should first notify the Board of his intention to sell, whereupon the Board would inspect, and in many cases would be able at once to declare the estate one which could be sold direct. The Board would not arrange the price, but the landlord would negotiate direct as at present, 59432-6, 59456, 59468-9, 59480-1.—If inspection showed that a portion needed treatment the Board should not tell the landlord to arrange as he could with his tenants about it, for many estates were mortgaged or liable to family changes on the entire. The two sections should be declared simultaneously—one to be bought by the Board, the other direct—at a price arranged before the issue of the certificate, 59429, 59432-7, 59440, 59455-6, 59460, 59468-9, 59491-2.—There would be no difficulty about inspection, but it must take place before the question of splitting up an estate could be determined, 59474.

MAPS REQUIRED

A landlord proposing to sell to the Board would have to lodge a map showing the actual holdings, as he had to do now for the Estates Commissioners. At present the Board only required him to show the boundary of his tenanted and untenanted land. Several properties were in such a state of rundale that only highly-skilled surveyors could have mapped them out extensively, and this would have meant considerable expense, 59417, 60246.

EFFECT ON PRICE OF SEPARATION OF ESTATE INTO TWO PORTIONS.

A bargain such as that contemplated above should not affect the total price. The land excluded from treatment should always be sold higher than the other, and though owners might ask too much, tenants were able to form a standard of prices, 59418-21.—Negotiations should be subsequent to inspection, but in any case the Board would not be justified in refusing a certificate, though compulsory powers should be used later if necessary; it was for the Estates Commissioners to approve the price in cases of direct sale, and to have the non-zone cases inspected; the Board's inspector could, when inspecting ascertain what the tenants were prepared to give, and could then, if invited by both parties, act as a friendly negotiator in regard to the direct sale; it would not be his duty to fix the price, but he might have to report that prices were such as the holdings were security for, or that they were within the zones, 59421-2, 59429-30, 59437, 59482, 59493-4.—It would probably be advisable not to issue the certificate until the price had been arranged for both sections of the estate; the aggregate price might be settled if the Board were not obliged to buy the good section, 59427-8, 59442-4, 59501.

PROPORTION OF CONGESTION WHICH SHOULD EXCLUDE AN ESTATE OR PORTION OF AN ESTATE FROM DIRECT SALE.

It would not be desirable to fix any proportion of congestion which would decide the Board to withhold the certificate; if ten out of a hundred tenants needed holdings rearranged they should be dealt with; any part of the estate not needing treatment should be excluded from purchase, or, in a case like the above, there would be a large transaction for small results; an estate with four or five scattered holdings needing improvement should pass direct; on a mixed estate the holdings were usually clustered together, and such a section with four or five tenants should be scheduled as congested, and treated; the Board could do this, and lose the ten per cent.; at present, though such a townland went through the agency of the Estates Commissioners, it did not actually pass into their possession, 59483-8, 59503-6.

POWERS OF THE BOARD IN REGARD TO DIRECT SALES. BOARD SHOULD HAVE SAME POWERS AS ESTATES COMMISSIONERS.

Most landlords would probably, if they could, make the sale conditional on the entire estate being bought. The Board would risk nothing by doing this, but their administration would be encumbered, and there would be delay and expense, 59445-51, 59502, 59507.—It was possible to fit part of an estate for sale more quickly than the rest, but the Board could not sell land until

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

they had paid for it. This difficulty could be met by giving the Board the same powers as were conferred on the Estates Commissioners by Section 6 of Act of 1903, when part of an estate was to be sold direct, of having the sale agreements executed by landlord and tenants, the Estates Commissioners being responsible for the total price agreed upon. The inspector might arrange that a certain number of tenants should buy direct at, say, £10,000, while the Board should buy the rest at, say, £40,000; if the landlord agreed he would receive both sums, in each case *plus* the bonus, the Board securing that the tenants would agree to, and pay, the price. This would be easy in practice, and on further consideration, witness believed it would be the best plan. First the Board would value, and after negotiating with the tenants, make up the gross price, asking the landlord to accept it on condition that three-fourths of the tenants signed undertakings to pay the prices making up the offer Tenants whose holdings were not to be improved were always willing to buy without delay, 59458-60, 59472-3, 59489, 59503, 59506, 59514-6, 59525, 59864-8, 59875, 60241-2.—Economic and uneconomic holdings running side by side would sometimes have to be dealt with together in order to carry out drainage, road-making, and the apportionment of turbary. There might be a bog centre affecting the whole estate, and the plan sketched out above had been suggested as a solution of this difficulty, 59411, 59494-8, 59500-1.—The Estates Commissioners' practice was to make all tenants sign agreements, even those whose holdings were to be affected, but the Board would not do this; if a man with surplus turbary signed an agreement to buy his holding without any reservation he would not allow that turbary to be allotted to other tenants, 59865, 59876-82. —If the owner of an estate needing treatment in any portion were dissatisfied with the gross price it would be the Board's duty to buy the whole property compulsorily. Estates with grass lands should be included in the above category, 59499, 59869-74.—Making Section 6 of Act of 1903 applicable to the Board would encumber their administration to some extent, but the only expense involved would be that now incurred by the Estates Commissioners in regard to the preparation and lodging of maps and agreements in cases of direct sale. The State would lose nothing, as the money for estates to be passed direct would have to come from the Land Purchase Fund, no matter who was the purchasing authority, 59448-51, 59508 12, 59554-7.—The undertakings might still be lodged with the Estates Commissioners, who in any case would have to deal eventually with the vesting. They would inspect as to boundaries and security of non-zone holdings on the normal section, as they now did on the whole of an estate. The Board's responsibility would end when the agreements had been obtained from vendor and tenants, these being subject, as in all cases of direct sale, to the approval of the Estates Commissioners. At present the Board's valuers were not from the Land Commission, except in respect of untenanted lands and holdings not subject to judicial tenancies, and then they only inspected for occupation. If, however, the Board employed them in the first instance a firm offer could be made to the landlord, for the Estates Commissioners probably could not offer the price unless the zone limits were abolished. The judgment of the Land Commission valuers should in any case be accepted as final, as it would be based on practical knowledge, whereas the Estates Commissioners would not have seen the holding in question, 59529-39, 59541-6.—No matter what was done estates needing treatment would have to be separated from others by somebody, 59548.

Guarantee Question.

The Board up to the present had been obliged to guarantee against default of annuities on all the sales That guarantee should not be applied to the larger volume of work proposed, because, being an accumulating liability, it would seriously affect the Board's position in a few years, 59540-1.

Cost of Inspection under proposed New Scheme.

Witness believed inspection cost a good deal in scattered cases, but £10,000 would probably well cover the outlay which the Board would have to meet under

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

the scheme suggested, 59536, 59557-9.—Transactions in regard to direct sales should not be included in the £1,000,000 which had been proposed as the Board's income for land purchase, or it would take about 25 years to pass the 17 to 30 millions worth of property to be dealt with, 59454, 59507, 59513, 59517-20, 59547, 59549-52.

It should be possible to exceed £1,000,000 a year in exceptional cases.

In any case it would be well if legislation were to provide for dealing with a larger output of estates needing treatment when the owners willing to sell and the tenants willing to buy represented property of value in excess of the proposed million a year. Otherwise there would probably be great dissatisfaction over the delay which would necessarily be incurred over the transfer of property, 59855.

Amount of Land which the Board should have in hands in order to turn out a million's Worth Annually.

If the Board turned out a million's worth of land a year they should hold nearly three millions' worth. The tenanted land would, on an average, be under treatment for two years. They should if possible have about a million's worth of untenanted land, as stock in hands, so as to give migrants a larger choice, only selling and buying one-third each year, 60008-10.

Means of obtaining Information as to Amount of Grass Lands available.

The only information of any value which could be obtained as to the amount of grass land available for migration had already been furnished to the Commission under the heading "Non-residential Holdings."* As to the number of years it would take to absorb all the grass lands of the eight counties, the estimate supplied by witness gave full information. It was an outside estimate, giving the poor law valuation and the acreage, 59773-6, 60004-7.

Re-organisation of Staff Required—Cost, &c.

The present outdoor staff cost between £18,000 and £20,000; the indoor staff £9,000 or £10,000, the total cost, including office expenses, being £31,000 or £32,000 The staff, now up to its full strength, would be able to deal with about £300,000 worth of property per year if in future they were allowed to proceed without interruption and delay. The amount of additional land which it was proposed to deal with would not proportionately increase the amount of work which would be done by the superior officers, but the staff should be reorganised; the outdoor staff should be trebled, because land should be turned out more rapidly, and much time would be taken up inspecting estates and negotiating for purchase From £50,000 to £60,000 would be needed, including expenses of clerks of works, surveyors, and inspectors, now charged to estates. The indoor staff would not need a proportionate increase, 60011-23, 60052-5.—The staff should be reorganised Instead of four inspectors and five assistants there should be nine inspectors—one in each county or other defined area; in some counties two would probably be needed. The inspector's duty would be to do in his district very much what witness tried to do over the whole area. there would be a chief inspector to supervise the others, and each of these last would direct and train men to carry out the detailed work, 60027-9, 60055-6. —An enormous staff would not be required for splitting up an estate into one section which needed and one which did not need treatment The revision of maps for the good portion would be a small matter; while the expense of mapping the other part would, as stated, fall on the landlord, 59417, 60242-6.

Procedure now followed by the Board in regard to Land Purchase

Proposals to sell to the Board were always sent through the Secretary. Witness then submitted a short report to the Board as to the advisability or otherwise of buying. If the estate seemed suitable he asked authority to inspect it; then, having inspected and valued, classifying the rental and

* See pp. 48–9.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

so forth, he reported to the Board, naming a maximum price they might offer, and giving an estimate as to the cost of re-arrangement; the offer if issued was prepared by the solicitor, and sent through the Secretary; the Board did not as a rule make a second offer. and their offer was always conditional on verification of the particulars supplied them; subsequent negotiations, up to the stage of purchase, were in the hands of witness and of his staff and assistants; the legal steps of the purchase were carried out by solicitors; meanwhile witness gave the Board a detailed estimate of the receipts and expenditure for the period from purchase to re-sale; witness could not exceed the limits laid down in the estimate and approved by the Board without authority from the Board; the work of re-arrangement was carried out by the Board's clerk of works and superintended by the inspectors and assistants, 60032-51.

UNCOMPLETED SALES.

If the Board were to operate in congested areas now in the hands of the Estates Commissioners some difficulty would arise in regard to uncompleted sales. The Estates Commissioners might hand over all originating requests and applications in respect of such estates to the Board to deal with, the Board deciding whether to certify the properties as fit to be passed by direct sale. If the estate had not been declared by the Estates Commissioners no agreement would have been entered into with the tenants. The landlord however, might reasonably object to the Board's reviewing the price proposed for holdings not within the zone conditions, he having lodged an agreement on the understanding that the Estates Commissioners alone could fulfil that function, 60233-9.

IMPENDING REVISION OF BONUS—EFFECT ON RATE SALES TO ESTATES COMMISSIONERS, THE BOARD BEING RESTRICTED FROM PURCHASE PENDING REPORT OF PRESENT COMMISSION.

Anticipating a change in the bonus adverse to their interests, landlords were anxious to sell as quickly as possible, and to get on the list for the payment of purchase money; according to Mr. Callan's figures nearly one-half of the holdings in counties containing congestion were either sold or had been offered for sale, and probably a very large proportion of the remaining half would be offered to the Estates Commissioners within the next three or four months; a considerable area of the non-economic and intermixed holdings could then be vested, and the problem of dealing with vested congestion would be much enlarged. Several Mayo landlords had lately approached witness, only to be told that the Board was debarred from purchasing at present, 60247-9.—On receiving this answer, Lord Arran's agent had at once arranged with the tenants on the following terms:—All the untenanted land on the estate would be given to tenants or their sons; other estates containing untenanted lands would be sold on the same conditions, and these estates would be bought at once, as owners would get nearly their own price from tenants on such terms, 60253.—A landlord had no right to force such an agreement on the Estates Commissioners, but the tenants themselves would insist on having the land regardless of the law, 60255-5.—If the sales of estates continued and the Board were debarred from buying the idea of forming a new Congested Districts Board should be abandoned, 60257-8.

WITHDRAWAL OF ALL POWER FROM BOARD AND ESTATES COMMISSIONERS TO GIVE LAND TO SONS OF TENANTS PROPOSED.

The Estates Commissioners had given fifteen out of seventeen new holdings near Castlerea to sons of tenants, 59911.—They had only done their duty under the Act of 1903, but their action made the work of migration on adjacent lands much more difficult both for themselves and for the Board, 59914.—Landholders openly stated that their sons had the first claim to holdings; the Estates Commissioners had given holdings near Castlerea to sons of tenants on the Dillon and De

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

Freyne Estates bought by the Board; the Board had only given four holdings to sons of tenants; the law should not only be altered in regard to the Estates Commissioners, but the Board's power of giving surplus land to sons of tenants should also be withdrawn, or it would be impossible to carry out migration on a large scale; at present the agitation which had arisen since the Act of 1903 was very effective in preventing people from migrating, but in face of it, the desire to migrate had increased; witness would not buy large blocks of land without knowing that the land acquired was passing satisfactorily to people who had surrendered land for the relief of congestion, 59908-33, 59977-8.

RE-SALE BY TENANT PURCHASERS—PRE-EMPTION QUESTION, &c.

The Board had done enough for their migrants, but they should be further helped by being given agricultural education and direction when put on their new holdings, 59853-5.—None of the Board's migrants had sold, and they were not likely to do so unless they failed from some cause, in which case a man ought to sell his interest; he would probably be replaced by a better man, and this would increase the security. The State was justified in losing so much in order to have a holding formed to be occupied by an industrious family for the benefit of the country, and in order to relieve congestion. It did not concern the State if a man sold within a month. A smaller loss would have been incurred by emigration, but no one advocated wholesale emigration as a desirable remedy for congestion, 59774-81.—It would not be unfair if the State refused to sanction a sale unless the loss previously entailed by migrating the holder were repaid, but there would be less inducement to migrate, 60003.—Legislation restricting an occupier from mortgaging his holding would not interfere with his credit, as this, in the case of a small holder, was largely regulated by his personal character and reputation. The proportion of small holdings sold for debts was very small, 60002.—When holdings in counties containing congested districts were put up for sale the Board should have the right of pre-emption, 60031.

COMPULSORY POWERS NEEDED IN ORDER TO ACQUIRE LARGE BLOCKS OF LAND.

The ground for the claim for compulsory powers was based upon the necessity of the Board's dealing with large blocks of districts. Granted these powers, the Board should operate in all the counties at the same time. They would be regulated in their mode of starting by the particular district in which they started, and by the estates offered them at the beginning of their operations. There should be a list, say, of ten centres in Mayo, with ten resident officers, each of whom would begin with one estate, widening the field of operations until the whole country was covered. When the Board began working in a centre where the landlord had offered to sell, and they made no trouble, conditions being favourable, the adjoining landlords almost invariably offered, and the area was gradually enlarged. Landlords seldom objected to a discreet inquiry as to their willingness to sell. Compulsion should not be resorted to hastily, and should only be used when a landlord refused to sell an estate either tenanted or untenanted which it was desirable to acquire. Satisfactory progress would probably be made in negotiations if the Board proceeded quietly, 59951-6.

PRICE REQUIRED TO GIVE LANDLORD HIS NET INCOME—EFFECT OF RATE OF INTEREST.

The Board since 1903 had paid 27½ years' purchase for grass land. This price, *plus* the bonus, would not give a man his net income on the 3½ per cent. basis. To do this it might be necessary to give as much as 35 years' purchase of the agricultural rent of the very good grass lands, because the rents obtainable for this for accommodation purposes were far in excess of their agricultural value. This, the very best land, was the last which the Board would

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

seek to acquire, or if they did buy it they would keep it for grazing, as it was much needed for this purpose in poor districts. In this case it would probably return what had been given for it. The Board's operations would diminish the demand as well as the supply of this land, for if the poorer land were taken from graziers they would no longer want grass lands for accommodation purposes, 59783-97, 59804-7.—No landlord would refuse to exchange his income from untenanted land for an investment at four per cent., as it could be proved that the majority of grazing rents in the West of Ireland had fallen considerably in the last twenty years, 59741, 59808.—Inferior land had deteriorated largely because store cattle had been fed on it continuously, while no manure had been put into it; the very best land had suffered least, but all kinds of grass lands had depreciated very much; for the last ten years not so much, and for the last five years still less. In several places the grazing rental had been stationary, but there had been no rise, a truer test of the letting value of grass lands would be furnished by the last five than by the last ten years, 59808-18.

POWERS OF PRE-EMPTION, RESUMPTION, DETERMINING FUTURE TENANCIES, &c.

The Board had sometimes acquired tenanted holdings by voluntary agreement; sometimes they had served notice to pre-empt, having been advised in several cases to pay the excessive prices offered when inquiry had shown the intending purchaser to be a *bona fide* one; a tenant holding under a judicial tenancy could not complete the sale of the tenant-right without first serving the landlord with a notice of his intention to sell and of the terms of sale. Holdings were not often sold by auction; the landlord would make an offer, and if he and the tenant failed to come to terms the Land Commission, after hearing both sides, would fix the price at which the landlord would pre-empt; in cases of resumption by the Board the prices had usually been arranged without going before the Land Commission, though in a few cases they had had to go into court, 59742-5.—An ordinary landlord could not resume possession of holdings for the enlargement of his demesne or for taking sites for the extension of a town; while the Act of 1903 empowered the Board to do so for the purpose of migration and the enlargement of holdings, as well as for the purposes above specified in the Act of 1881, 59747.—Witness did not think the Estates Commissioners had the Board's extended powers of resumption. Notice for resumption might be served at any time, and a year's notice was not necessary, as it usually was in the case of determining a future tenancy. Any landlord could do that by serving notice to quit, and the Board had done so in several cases, but had had to give compensation in accordance with the scale laid down by the Act of 1881. This was fixed according to the rent payable and the number of years' purchase the tenant was to get for disturbance, 59751-3.—He was also paid for the unexhausted value of his improvements; this was always settled by the County Court Judge; there had evidently been some mistake in the drafting of the Act, for the Board had no power of resuming possession of a present yearly tenancy. They had first to serve notice on the tenant to have a fair rent fixed, and then serve the resumption notice. There had lately been several such cases, 59759-61.

MAINTENANCE OF IMPROVEMENTS.

The Board had spent a great deal on main drainage and accommodation roads with most satisfactory results, but as there was no provision for the maintenance of these drains and roads, they would probably before twenty years be almost as bad as before, 59980.—The Board never made either a drain or a road for the benefit of one holding. The County or District Council should be made responsible for the maintenance of the arterial drainage, with power to levy a rate on the holdings benefited. It was very important that there should be a central official authority to make the County Councils do their duty in this respect, 59984-5.—The Board had contributed thousands of

DORAN, Mr. HENRY—*continued.*

pounds towards roads which could not be dealt with by the county, but they had also made many accommodation roads for access to detached parts of holdings, bogs, etc., and it would not be fair to require the people who did not use these roads to pay for them. Possibly the Department of Agriculture could make some small contribution towards the upkeep of these roads in the interests of agricultural development, 59991-3, 59999.—The new Board should have compulsory powers to call on the people accommodated by a particular road to repair it if necessary, and in the event of their failing to do this, to make a levy for the cost of having it put into proper condition. There was not much danger of houses being allowed to go out of repair, 60001.

IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSES: BOARD'S HOUSES—IMPROVEMENTS SCHEME DID NOT OVERLAP WORK OF COMMISSION.

The purchase of land in blocks would not do away with the need for Parish Committees, because the Board would wish to deal with estates quickly in two or three years, and they could not in that time ensure all the houses being improved. The conditions which the Board while dealing with an estate offered for the improvement of the houses were far more favourable than those offered by the Parish Committees, and though a fair number of people took advantage of this, very many could not be induced to carry out desirable improvements while the Board could employ them at full wages, 59895-902.—They were engaged when at home in road-making and drainage in the summer, and at fencing, etc., in the winter. In spite of the Board's efforts a very large proportion of bad houses remained on many estates, 59905.—In the idle time of the year people worked under the Parish Committee schemes, and the House Improvement scheme in most of the poor districts was too slow to allow of its being withdrawn on sale of the estate. No one with a holding on an estate being treated by the Board could get a grant under the schemes, so there was no over-lapping. In any case the Parish Committee's work extended over the whole congested area, and was not confined to estates bought by the Board, 59905-7.

MITCHELL, Mr. F. W. D.

See pp. 36-9.

COST OF ADMINISTRATION.

The cost of the Board's administration, including estates, fisheries and everything, amounted for the present year to £36,000. The share of this attributable to the estates business was about £25,000, made up as follows:—Outdoor staff and expenses = about £10,000; indoor staff and office expenses = (roughly estimated), £12,100; law staff and expenses = £4,000. This last figure was unusually high, due to some of the charges for previous years having been paid this year; the normal amount would be at least £2,500, 60259-70, 60296, 60300.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN STAFF, ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE, ETC.

In the Estates Branch there were 16 temporary clerks and witness proposed adding 16 more in order to deal with the trebled amount of work it was proposed to entrust to the Board. There was no reason to suppose that the other estates would be less trouble than those already treated; witness understood that estates to be passed for direct sale were not to be included in the million's worth of land on which expenditure was being calculated; the head of the branch was the only permanent civil servant; he was chief clerk and senior man in the office next to the Secretary and Assistant-Secretary and drew a salary of £500 a year. The salaries of the temporary clerks ranged from 25s. a week to £200 a year, 60264-75.—For the first few months they had 25s. a week, and if efficient, their salary was gradually increased. As a rule the maximum salary was about £150, but there were one or two temporary

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

MITCHELL, Mr. F. W. D.—*continued.*

clerks, who had been in the office 12 years or more, receiving £200. The clerical staff was paid at a lower rate in the aggregate than any department of the Civil Service in Ireland It had not been proposed to increase the salaries; they had been estimated at £100 a year each, which would allow for some increments The temporary clerks would like to be made permanent civil servants and given the right to pensions, 60276-9.—There would be an increase in the collection of rents corresponding to the increased number of estates it was proposed to deal with. The Land Commission did not collect the annuities until the holdings had been re-sold. There was an officer in charge of the rent branch of the outdoor staff, with a salary between £300 and £400, and a third-class clerk receiving £172. There were eleven temporary clerks, and witness proposed to add eleven more The accounts branch did work in addition to that connected with estates The present staff consisted of a bookkeeper, at from £350 to £400, two third-class clerks, one with £180, and one with £95, and eleven other clerks. Witness suggested adding twelve temporary clerks, involving an additional expenditure of £1,200 in salaries, 60287-91.—The correspondence branch and the stores branch should also be considerably increased. The work of the former was chiefly in connection with estates. The aggregate increase needed would be £14,600. This would cover the cost of office maintenance, printing, stationery, postage and telegrams. To this something should be added in order to increase the salaries of the men holding office, as an enlarged staff would entail more work. Then there were about half-a-dozen heads of branches who would naturally expect higher salaries for the same reason, 60291-95. —After consulting with Mr. O'Connor, witness had decided that the present law staff expenditure should be raised to £6,500. Experience had shown the advisability of making a rather liberal estimate, but £500 might be taken off and spent in increasing the above-mentioned salaries, 60296-304.

Amount of Interest paid by the Board, Loans would be needed.

The Board were now paying an abnormal amount of interest—£9,000 on their estimate for the current year—chiefly because they had not yet repaid a sum of nearly £50,000, and this year they were paying instalments as well as interest. The above sum had been borrowed from the Board of Works, with the consent of the Treasury, out of the local loans fund, on the security of the Church Surplus Grant, for the improvement of estates, and to some extent also for other purposes, *e.g.*, Raiffeisen banks, agricultural loans and loans to tenants. If the Board had 3 millions' worth of property in hands it would be fair to assume that the amount they could borrow from the Board of Works would be £200,000—the enhanced value recoverable on that amount of land. Under the Treasury rules they could not borrow more than they would probably be able to recover out of the expenditure. The estimate had been based on past experience. The Board had no fund from which they could draw in order to meet the heavy expenditure entailed by estates when in hands. When they re-sold they could only recover a small portion of the outlay, losing the balance and the interest, 60305-12 —In cases of emergency, the Board had a statutory right under the Act of 1891 to draw a portion of the Church Surplus Grant of £1,500,000 if the Treasury approved It would be quite allowable and doubtless advisable if this were done in the present circumstances, but it might be objectionable to borrow any large part of a sum of money which the Board had given as security A considerable sum had been guaranteed to cover the purchase by tenant-purchasers in the Board's area, but since the last Act the whole sum was not in the contingent guarantee. The Treasury might, however, help in another way, viz., by giving a loan from the Board of Works. Borrowing from the Grant would mean paying interest at the rate of 2¾ instead of 3½ per cent. A great emergency had arisen, and if it were known that the Treasury would not advance the £25,000 asked for in the estimate, Mr. Doran should be wired to immediately to stop all the work being done on estates, as the Board would be bankrupt at the end of the month, 60313-33.

Floating Capital which would be needed.

Mr. Doran assumed that there would continue to be delay in recovering the proceeds of estates on re-sale, and the Board would need some floating capital to tide them over this interval. Hitherto they had accumulated some floating capital by saving, but it had been insufficient, and there would be a £40,000 deficit at the end of this year. If Parliament gave the Board a sufficiently large income they might be able to save enough the first year to provide a floating capital. They had a surplus every year on their estimates. They never exceeded their income and had several times stopped Mr. Doran's work in order to avoid a deficit. The Board's work had been increasing too fast for their means; even if they had a surplus they would not have to surrender it to the Government, as did other departments. They only submitted their accounts to obtain the formal sanction of the Treasury, 60333-44.

Loss on Estates.

The adoption of Mr. Doran's proposal that the cost of Clerks of Works and Surveyors should in future be charged to administration, would, roughly speaking, bring his estimated loss on estates down to £125,000, *i.e.*, to 12½ instead of 15 per cent., 60345-9.

Proposed Increased Expenditure on Parish Committees.

It had been suggested that the Board would like to increase the number and enlarge the grants of Parish Committees, raising the total expenditure in this direction from £12,000 to £20,000. If all Connaught were scheduled the Board would have to refuse to listen to the applications for grants, with which they would be besieged 60356-9.—No allowance had been made in the estimate for agricultural development, and only 50 per cent. had been added, on a rough guess, for industrial development. When the Board had helped Foxford so liberally they had had plenty of funds, but since then they had not the means to encourage any such project, 60364-9.

Expenditure on Fisheries.

The gross expenditure, direct and indirect, on fishing during the previous year—a normal one—had been £40,000, out of which £26,000 had been recovered. There should be more officers, and the Board should spend more on piers and perhaps on boats. They were now paying £3,900 for steamer services, £3,000 of which was the cost of the *Granuaile*. Witness had assumed in his estimate that the Board would not revive subsidies which had been withdrawn, although they might do this if they had the means, 60379-86.

Transfer of Agricultural Work from the Board to the Department.

The Board would never have consented to the transfer of the agricultural work to the Department had they known that what they had been carrying on at a cost of £11,000 was to be practically extinguished by being reduced to £2,000. Parliament should have given a further grant, but the Department should not have accepted the transfer until they had the necessary money. Witness believed they were now expending up to £10,000, 60370-8.—Witness had no authority for his estimate; he merely wished to help the Commission to judge how Mr. Doran's proposals would work in with the income; the figures had been made up hastily, 60359, 60386.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

ROYAL COMMISSION ON CONGESTION IN IRELAND.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

ONE HUNDREDTH AND FOURTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22ND, 1908.

AT 11 O'CLOCK A.M.

In Westminster Palace Hotel, London.

Present:—The Right Hon. the Earl of DUDLEY, G.C.V.O. (Chairman); The Right Hon. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I.; The Right Hon. Sir JOHN COLOMB, K.C.M.G., The Right Hon. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT, G.C.B.; Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL; JOHN ANNAN BRYCE, Esq., M.P.; WALTER KAVANAGH, Esq., D.L.; ANGUS SUTHERLAND, Esq.;

and WALTER CAILAN, Esq., Secretary.

Mr. HENRY DORAN recalled and re-examined.*

Jan. 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

59394. CHAIRMAN.—We are anxious, Mr. Doran, to obtain from you some further evidence with reference to the probable loss that would be incurred in dealing with estates which need treatment in the counties containing congested districts?—The Secretary having informed me that the Commission desired to obtain some further evidence from me as to the probable loss that would be incurred in dealing with estates that needed treatment in the counties containing congested districts, I have prepared particulars of the actual loss incurred by the Board in the treatment of estates purchased under the Irish Land Act, 1903, and which since then have either been sold or are now ready for sale.

59395. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—Have all these estates needed treatment?—Yes, but they differed considerably.

59396. All of them have needed treatment?—Yes. These are estates that were purchased under the Act——

59397. CHAIRMAN.—In order to make it quite clear would you tell me does this memorandum of yours† include only the estates which have needed treatment, or does it include all the estates purchased under the Act of 1903?—It includes only so many of the estates purchased under the Act of 1903 as have been actually prepared for sale.

59398. And treated?—And treated.

59399. Have there been, as Sir Francis asks, other estates which the Board have purchased which have not required any treatment?—There have been no such estates.

59400. There are no, what you might call, good estates to set off against these estates which required treatment?—These estates were made up of grass lands, poor tenanted estates, and very poor tenanted estates.

59401. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It was contemplated as a possible arrangement that estates should be sold to the tenants on a certificate from the Congested Districts Board, that they might pass. No such estates as those have come into the categories that are here put down in your paper?—No.

59402. These are estates that required treatment?—That required very substantial treatment.

59403. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—As a matter of fact, I presume that the policy of the Board has been to acquire only estates that required treatment, or estates which, by reason of having untenanted land, lent themselves to the treatment of congested estates?—They have not bought any other class of estates.

59404. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—Did not the Board seek on one hand untenanted land, and on the other the poorest class of untenanted estates?—Not quite the poorest, but poor estates. The Board have not up to the present purchased any tenanted estates, except those that needed substantial treatment, and untenanted land, or an estate which was partly tenanted and partly untenanted.

Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—That elucidates the point.

59405. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—Now, is there any likelihood of their acquiring any estates that do not require any treatment, or that they would not require for the treatment of other estates?—No. I would not think so; I do not think they ought to buy such an estate. Perhaps I ought to explain, first of all, that the reason I submit particulars of this group of estates to the Commission is that in my opinion they are an average type of what will have to be dealt with by the Board, and that the Board have not carried out any works upon them that are not necessary. They have treated them as economically as estates of the kind could be treated while effecting substantial improvements upon them. Consequently I submit that the results of the operations on these estates afford about the safest information that is available for you to form an opinion of the net loss in the treatment of similar estates.

59406. Mr. BRYCE.—Before you leave this part of the subject, suppose that the Commissioners were to recommend that the whole of Connaught should, for buying purposes, be put under the Congested Districts Board, are there not estates in Connaught—I don't mean merely in the present congested districts counties, but in Connaught—which might require no treatment?—There are several.

59407. Only so far you have not acquired any?—The Board have always declined to buy such estates.

59408. There are not very many of these estates?—I assume that they would be about one-fourth of the unsold estates.

59409. These would require no treatment?—No. It is only a rough estimate, in fact, a guess.

Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—We have in the statistics that assuming that the holdings now being dealt with by the Estates Commissioners are excluded from the operations of the Board, there are 30,000 holdings over £10 valuation. Of these 30,000 holdings only a comparatively small number, as I understood, would be dealt with by the Board.

* For former examinations, see Appendix to the First Report of the Commission [Cd. 3267, 1906], p. 75; Appendix to the Eighth Report [Cd. 3839, 1907], p. 13; Appendix to the Ninth Report [Cd. 3845, 1908], p. 74; and Appendix to the Tenth Report [Cd. 4007, 1908], p. 232.

† See p. 41.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

59410. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—I think Mr. Doran was making his calculation rather by estates than by holdings —That about one-fourth of the estates would pass without improvement.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—We had these figures from Mr. Callan. He stated that there were 80,000 holdings under £10 valuation, and that there were 30,000 holdings over £10 valuation not dealt with, that is, excluding the holdings now being dealt with by the Estates Commissioners. Of the 30,000 holdings perhaps 5,000, it was suggested, might come under the Board's treatment, leaving 25,000 holdings which would be sold under the ordinary law.

Sir John Colomb.—I think it is given as 84,954, of which 74,000 do not exceed £10 valuation.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—You are referring to the scheduled districts: I am talking of the larger area.

59411. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—When you say that one-fourth might pass without treatment by the Board, I take it that you meant that the Board would be able to declare portions of a large estate a separate estate, so as to allow those separate portions to pass unimproved, while the Board would improve the remainder?—That is so. I don't think you can go by holdings, for the reason that you will always find holdings that do not require treatment adjoining holdings that do require treatment in the same townland. You cannot exclude those, because if you do you very often would not be able to carry out land improvement work such as drainage, road-making, and the apportionment of the turbary. If you exclude all holdings that you do not want to spend money on you would very often make it impossible to carry out drainage works, road-making, and the apportionment of turbary.

59412. When you calculate, roughly, that one-fourth of these properties might pass to the tenants unimproved, I take that one-fourth to comprise entire estates and portions of other estates, that, by such a body as the Congested Districts Board, might be declared estates capable of passing without improvement?—Yes. That is it. My idea is this: that if the Board were offered a large estate we would have it examined, first, by an inspector, with a view to seeing if there are substantial portions of it that do not need treatment, or tenanted holdings upon it that cannot be enlarged, no land being available. I would think that there would be no object in the Board purchasing such a section of an estate if it did not need improvement, or if they are not in a position to improve it in any way, either by the enlargement or the re-arrangement of holdings; and it would appear desirable to make a separate estate of such a portion, and let it pass direct from landlord to the purchasers. It would be objectionable for the Board to purchase and hold an estate upon which they did not intend to carry out any substantial improvement. Such action would certainly lead to great dissatisfaction, and would make the work of the Board on estates that needed radical treatment much more difficult.

59413 Chairman.—Your view is that where an estate exists that does not need improvements the Board could, by granting a certificate, allow that estate to pass in the ordinary manner from landlord to tenant?—Yes; and should do so in respect of every estate, or every portion of an estate, that they were not in a position substantially to improve, or that does not need improvement.

59414. Sir Francis Mowatt —In the percentages of loss which you have given here you have included the parts of these estates that required no treatment?—Yes, but they are mostly scattered holdings.

59415 Mr. Kavanagh.—Would you contemplate giving a certificate to a landlord for one portion of his estate and not for the other portion?—What I contemplate doing is that on an examination of the estate it might be found that there was half or quarter of it, or even a townland, that was not connected with the development of that estate or the adjacent estates —those must also be kept in view in connection with drainage and road making—then any such portion of an estate, even to a townland, upon which the Board could do no good by purchasing, should be made a separate estate, and the Board should buy the remainder of the estate direct.

59416. Do you think that there would not be any difficulty in the landlord and tenant coming to terms on the part for which you gave a certificate? What I mean is that I think it would be difficult to negotiate between landlord and tenant if portion of an estate was excluded?—If they understood the reasons for the splitting up of the estate I anticipate that they would always arrange terms.

57417. Sir Antony MacDonnell —Would not you require to have maps made of the estate that you would keep and of the estate that you would be disposed to release?—Yes. A vendor, on proposing to sell the estate to the Board, must lodge a map. At present he is only required to show the boundaries of the estate, and the boundary of the tenanted and untenanted land; but under the new procedure, such as you are discussing, I would say it would be necessary for a vendor, in the first instance, to lodge a map, showing the actual holdings, as they are required now to do for the Estates Commissioners. The Estates Commissioners require a vendor to lodge a map, showing each holding. The Congested Districts Board, desiring to make the cost of negotiating a sale as low as possible, only required vendors to lodge a map showing the boundary of the tenanted portions of the estates and the untenanted portions, but not showing the individual holdings; mainly for the reason that several of the estates offered to the Board were in such a state of rundale and intermixed plots, that vendors could not get local surveyors competent to make the surveys, and would have had to employ highly skilled men, and it would put them to considerable expense to have these rundale estates mapped on a large scale. Consequently, the Board, in order to facilitate the vendor, decided they would only ask him to show the boundary of the tenanted land and the boundary of the untenanted land, within the outer boundary of the estate.

59418 Sir Antony MacDonnell.—What would be the effect, as far as one can imagine, on the price, of such bargains as that, whereby properties should be split up into good and bad parts, and each of these declared a separate estate?—I don't think that it will affect the total price.

59419. As a matter of fact, don't you think that a landlord would be disposed to put a higher price upon the good land, knowing that the bad land would be freed from all arrangements regarding the zones, and that it would be purchased by the Congested Districts Board?—The good portions of the estate, which would be excluded from treatment, should always go at a higher price.

59420. Of course, they would go at a higher price. That goes without saying. But my question is don't you think that the landlord would be disposed to put a higher price on the good part with a view of protecting himself against loss upon the worst part?—Of course, he might do that; but tenants having knowledge of the transactions all round them, as they occur, get to a standard of prices.

59421. It would upset, at all events, the principle of arrangements by which the price of the whole, the good and the bad, is had regard to?—I don't think it would, and I don't think it ought, because I assume that when the vendor offers his estate to the Congested Districts Board he would not settle the price with the people beforehand; that the negotiations as to price would be subsequent to the inspection by the Board's officers, with a view to issue of certificate for direct sale of the entire or portion of it, and the price for the better portions to be sold direct could be arranged by vendor and tenants, as at present.

59422 Chairman —Supposing that land which was good land or of the kind that was certified by the Board to be in a condition in which it might pass direct from landlords to tenants, and supposing that, as Sir Antony MacDonnell foreshadows, the landlord was disposed, because the land was very good, to put up the price to an impossible figure, would not the Board have the power to say, "No; in these circumstances we won't certify that it is land which can pass direct from landlord to tenant, but we will purchase that land on the basis of so-and-so." Would not that be a safeguard?——

Mr. Kavanagh —The certificate would have been given before, surely.

Chairman.—The certificate might be made with a proviso?—I do not think that the Board would be justified in refusing to certify for those reasons, but the issue of a certificate ought not to bar them from putting compulsory powers into operation at a later period if they deemed it necessary.

59423. Might not the certificate be made conditional?—It appears to me that they should certify for all estates that they cannot substantially improve by taking over.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

59426. Most Rev Dr. O'Donnell.—But do you advert to the point that you are dealing with an estate which contains two sections—a section which may pass unimproved, and a section which needs improvement? Do you think would not the Congested Districts Board dealing with these insist on knowing the terms on which it must purchase the poorer part before it issued any certificate as to the passage of the other part of the estate from landlord to tenant?—The certificate could not possibly issue, as I understand, until after inspection.

59427 Do you think would the Board dream of issuing a certificate for the better part until it had come to a substantial understanding as to the price at which the other portion might be bought direct?—It would probably be a more satisfactory procedure not to issue the certificate until the price was arranged for both sections of the estate.

59428. That is what I was coming to. Does not it come to this then—before the Board makes up its mind as to apportioning off a part of the estate and declaring it a separate estate the Board will have come to an understanding with the owner about the aggregate price for the whole estate?—That would be satisfactory if the Board had not to buy the portion that did not need treatment.

59429. Chairman.—The Board could say to the owner—"Here is land which we admit does not require improvement, and therefore we are not anxious to deal with this land at all; we don't want to deal with it. You can go ahead, and arrange with your tenants with regard to this land, and if you can come to a satisfactory arrangement with your tenants, then come to us, and we will certify that the land is in a fit state to pass to the tenants"; and if there as any difficulty, if the landlord was to ask an absurd price, than the Board, as I understand it, should be perfectly free to say—"We are going to purchase this land; you have not been able to arrange with your tenants, we are not going to have a lot of this land lying in the centre of your estate unpurchased, and therefore we are going to purchase it on the basis that has been laid down by Parliament, and re-sell to the tenants"?—I think that it ought to work out in practice in this way. An estate has been offered *in globo* to the Board, and after inspection they decide that there is a certain portion of it that they ought to purchase. During the inspection the inspector would ascertain from the tenants the price they were willing to pay. The inspector could, if desired by the vendor and tenants, assist in arranging the price for the portion which it was intended to sell by direct sale, and if the Board arranged with vendor for the remaining section the declaring of both estates should occur at the same time—one section for purchase by the Board at a price, and the other portion bought by the tenants direct at a price arranged before issue of certificate.

59430. Sir Francis Mowatt.—May I ask would the certificate of the Board depend upon the acceptance by the landlord of the price fixed by the inspector? An estate has two parts, and, as I understand you to say, you would propose that the inspector when he inspects should put a value upon the part of the land which may pass direct, and on the part of the land which required treatment. Would you say that the certificate of the Board would depend upon the acceptance by the landlord of the valuation made by the inspector of the two parts?—No. I would not say that in respect of the portion to be sold by direct sale; I suggest that the inspector would merely act as negotiator if invited to do so.

59431. Chairman.—Would you advise that? What has the inspector got to do with it? It is a question of voluntary sale, voluntary negotiations between the landlord and the tenant for land that does not require treatment. It is not the business, to my mind, of an inspector or anybody else to interfere in that case between the landlord and the tenant. It is for the landlord and tenant to come to terms, and to arrange between themselves at what price the land should pass. The only difficulty is the question of the certificate, should you grant the certificate, and take it out of the hands of the Board before the negotiations have taken place? Then if those negotiations fail you are left with a district of tenanted land, which has not been dealt with, lying in the midst of the Board's property. The tenants will clamour for some arrangement. They will say they cannot come to terms, and then things will go on in an unsatisfactory condition. My point is, cannot you hold over your certificate and say: "We don't want to deal with this land; it is not land which is of any use to us, but at the same time of course we want it sold; we want it to change hands with the property lying all round it; go and make an agreement with your tenants if you can make a satisfactory agreement, and then come to us, and we will certify." If these negotiations fail, then the Board can say: "Well, rather than allow this land to remain in an unsatisfactory or unbought condition we will buy it." That seems to me fairly simple, but I don't think that the price which an inspector sets out should come in at all in a voluntary arrangement between landlord and tenant?—I am afraid that I have not made myself quite clear.

59432. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—I think you have had compulsory purchase of land in view. This is a voluntary arrangement, and as a voluntary arrangement works out, is not this what you are cognisant of—that the landlord and tenant have their bargain made before they come to the Board at all?—They have not, and we don't desire that they should have.

59433. They frequently have?—Yes, in a very small proportion of the estates purchased by the Board, and the existence of such agreements have always increased our difficulties in dealing with the estate.

59434. Sir John Colomb.—The whole position would be changed. Their policy would not be to stop voluntary purchase on estates that did not require re-arrangement of part or the whole. I want to know this: is it in your mind that the landlord is to get the certificate first before he negotiates with his tenants, or that the certificate is to be asked for after he enters into agreements with all his tenants and they are completed? Which is the position that you take up? Take the position of the landlord in Connaught within the area—assuming Connaught to be within your area, and powers of compulsion given—who wants to sell direct to his tenants. Is he to apply to the Board before he begins negotiating for the certificate, or is he to apply to the Board when the negotiations with his tenants are completed? Which is your position?—My position would be that he ought to apply to the Board before he arranges prices, and after inspection he would be informed of the portion, if any, of the estate which the Board were prepared to certify as a separate estate for direct sale.

59435. Now, before the Congested Districts Board can give him that certificate he must open his estates for inspection—must he not?—Yes.

59436. If the estate on inspection is approved of, and a certificate that no re-arrangement was necessary is given, then he is in a position to be free to negotiate with his tenant-purchasers, but the result of the inspection will affect tenants' minds as regards price?—I think the best way is to explain how I would propose to proceed in the matter. A landlord in any of the counties containing congested estates has decided to sell his estate. Having done so, he notifies the Congested Districts Board of his intention to sell, with a view of ascertaining from the Board whether they consider that his estate or any portion of it ought to be sold to them or sold by direct sale. Before a reply can be given the Board must have the estate inspected. If the inspector reports it is an estate that needs little or no re-arrangement, or that the Board have no means of improving or enlarging the small holdings upon it, and that the inspector ascertained that tenants were not likely to migrate, if land could be got elsewhere—I would say in such a case the vendor should be informed that the Board were prepared to declare that property to be an estate that might pass by direct sale.

59437. Sir Francis Mowatt.—That part of the property might be declared an estate, because that is important?—I am taking the whole first, and I then come to the second case. The object of splitting in the second case would be this, that the Congested Districts Board want to reduce the dimensions of the problem, and one of the best ways in which this can be done is by excluding from their control all estates, or portions of estates, that they cannot substantially improve, in order to reduce to a minimum the area to be prepared for sale by the Board. Consequently, when the inspector reports that certain portions of the estate do not need treatment, and might be sold direct while the remainder of it is an estate that needs substantial treatment, and should not

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

be sold except through the Board, I don't think the Board should say to the landlord: "We will exclude the portion not needing treatment, and let you make such arrangements as you can with your tenants, and when you do so the Board are prepared to declare it to be a separate estate." That would rarely be feasible, for this reason. Many of these properties are mortgaged, or are liable to family charges secured on the entire, and a vendor could not sell one section of his estate and leave the other out, so that the two transactions, in my opinion, must usually be carried out at the same time; and while it would be no part of the duty of the inspector of the Congested Districts Board to fix a price between landlord and tenant on the portions of the estate that the Board do not propose taking over, it might be, on the other hand, his duty to report that the prices were such as the holdings were security for, or if the zone standard of valuing continued to apply, that they are within the zones.

59438. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Will you just allow me to put you in the position of a landlord? He generally knows in dealing with his tenants whether he probably would be able to come to terms with all his tenants on the estate which would enable him to sell. According to your procedure, you first have to get the Congested Districts Board to send an inspector, and the Congested Districts Board's inspector rules out of the estate so many tenants because he considers that their lands need treatment; and then the Board say, "We will give you a certificate for the rest." Do you think now, knowing the country as you do, that the landlord, in those circumstances, would have any hope of coming to a voluntary agreement as to the rest of his estate when the tenants hear that the Congested Districts Board are coming in to the other part of it? And do you not think that it would, in effect, absolutely stop direct sale?—I had that objection in my mind when I suggested that both sections should be arranged for at the same time. I don't anticipate any difficulty in this. For instance, the tenants of the estate will know quite as well as the officer of the Board that a certain portion of the estate needs no improvement, that the Board cannot do much for it; and the tenants on these holdings will have no desire to have them bought by the Board, and be kept in hands for a couple of years, when they are aware that the Board are not going to spend money on the holdings. For that reason I think the proposed procedure will work out fairly well.

59439. What do you mean by doing it simultaneously? I don't exactly follow you. When you say that the operations of the Board and the voluntary sale by the landlord in agreement with his tenants should go on simultaneously, do you mean to say that the Board's schemes should be determined, where they are to go and what they are to do, by the landowners wishing to sell direct?—A landlord first offers his estate to the Board.

59440. I am taking the case of a landlord who wants to sell voluntarily?—If he does desire to sell, he may approach the Board, and ask if they are prepared to certify his estate for direct sale, and if the Board decide to split up the estate an effort should be made to have the price for both sections arranged at the same time.

59441. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—He either offers it to the Board or he asks the Board to certify that it is an estate that they can pass?—The result of that is an inspection, and the result of the inspection is a decision as to whether the entire or portion of the estate may be certified for direct sale.

59442. The application is either that the Board should buy or that the Board should give a certificate. Now, suppose the application is that the Board should buy. When the Board receives that application, it inspects, and asks the vendor his price—is not that so?—Yes.

59443. The price is distributed over the good and the bad portions of the estate—Is not that so?—Yes.

59444. Suppose that the Board and the vendor are able to come to terms, and recognise that certain terms are fair for the whole estate, for the two portions of it together, and suppose that the Board would say, "It will convenience us, in practical management, that it should be divided into two, and that one portion of it should pass direct to the tenants and you should sell the other direct to us," is not that the way the thing would work out?—That is a way it might be arranged. But I meant to convey all along that when the Board was making those arrangements their inspector would assist in getting the price fixed for both sections.

Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It is obvious you might get a complicated case, but to illustrate my argument I want to get the simplest case—that is, an estate in regard to which the Board and the vendor agree about the price. Even after they have agreed about the price, it is not necessary that the whole estate should be sold direct to the Board. Some of it may be sold direct to the tenants. Is not it the case that whether the Board buy direct itself or whether it sanction a direct transaction with the tenants, in every case the Board would be careful to ascertain what they think they are going to give?

59445. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose the landlord refuses to do that. Take the particular case that the estate is offered to the Board, and the Board fix a price, which is distributed over the good and the bad land, and that the Board say to the vendor, "It would be a great convenience if we were not obliged to take that portion of your property which we don't want to improve, and it would meet our convenience if we were to certify that portion to be a property such as could pass direct to the tenants, and we will buy the rest." Suppose you were the landlord, would not you be likely to say, "That would complicate matters. I don't want to deal with two people. I don't want to have the trouble of negotiating with the tenants for this portion of the land. I want you to take the rest. I offer it to you *in globo* or not at all." Suppose a landlord took that line, what would you do?—Most landlords would take that line, if they could oblige the Board to buy the entire.

59446. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—I did not make my question clear. I did not suppose that the good portion would be left on the hands of the owner at all?—Let me put it in another way. My view is that if the landlord offers to sell his estate, or if the landlord applies to have his property declared an estate, in both cases it must be inspected, and in both cases the terms of sale could be arranged for it in one or two sections.

59447. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—The sale to the Board?—No. The sale must go through somehow. Once the landlord decides to sell, he will have to sell his estates either this year or next year. If the Board find certain portions of an estate, which they learn through their inspector needs treatment, then they have to say, "We cannot agree to certify your property to be an estate which should be sold on direct sale: there is a certain portion of it, however, which we will be prepared to certify."

59448. Surely, the landlord is not asking for that. *Ex hypothesi*, he is asking to sell the whole estate to the Board?—I was taking the whole case first. I will take it either way.

59449. CHAIRMAN.—You are taking the supposition that he was asking for a certificate to sell direct?—In one case the landlord offers to sell his estate to the Board, and the Board inspects——

59448. And the Board says, "There is part of the land which we don't want to buy, because we cannot improve it." Then the Board cannot expect that the landlord will agree to sell to them the portion that they are willing to buy without at the same time having an arrangement made for the purchase price of the portion of the estate that they desire to exclude, can they?

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Suppose that the Board come to the conclusion that there is one portion of the estate which requires treatment, then, instead of their offering a certificate to the landlord on which he is to make an agreement with the tenants, what objection is there to the Board buying the whole estate?—None whatever, except encumbering their administration with property which they cannot improve.

59450. I don't see that they are encumbering themselves. The Board are taking no risk. If it is within the zones, where is the risk to the Board?—There is no risk to the Board, but there is delay and expense incidental to the sale of the holdings to the tenants.

59451. Then, what is the objection?—I make no other objection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.—I don't think it was Mr. Doran's suggestion.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—There is portion of an estate which does not require treatment. Why should not the Board deal with the whole estate, and deal with those tenants, and get rid of it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND.—I don't think that the contrary was argued.

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. KAVANAGH.—It is the only way out of the difficulty.

CHAIRMAN.—That the Board would take it over?

Mr. KAVANAGH.—Yes. The difficulties of splitting an estate with one portion sold to the Board and the other sold to tenants by voluntary sale are too numerous to be contemplated. I think that if there is portion of an estate requiring improvement, and the Board require that portion, then the whole estate should be taken by the Board.

59453. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose you purchase *in globo* from the vendors an estate upon which there are holdings that require treatment, while there are parts that do not require treatment. Could you allow the Board to declare the part that does not require treatment an estate, and allow it to pass over rapidly to the tenants, retaining the other part to be improved?—I was going to say that that was obviously a way out of the difficulty. If the Board got power to purchase an estate, and divide it, and sell portion of it direct, as soon as possible, after arranging with the vendor, that would get over the difficulty that has been discussed.

59454. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—I should have thought that that was what we were trying to arrive at from the very beginning. Why could not the Board buy the whole estate, and sell the one half direct and the second half after they had done the required treatment?—The only remark I have to make is that if you limit the output of the Board to £1,000,000 a year, as suggested, and if you include all these transactions in the limited output, it will take a long time to get rid of all the land that you want to deal with.

59455. Mr. KAVANAGH.—How many generations will it take to get over the difficulty of splitting an estate in two and selling one to the Board and leaving the other to be carried out by voluntary sale? You could never do it?—That is why I suggested from the beginning that both transactions should be carried out simultaneously. I think that very few estates could be so divided by reason of mortgages and family charges, unless the sale of both sections could be carried out about the same time.

59456. CHAIRMAN.—How about an estate where a vendor applies to the Board for a certificate for a direct sale—there is a difference there?—There is. Because, in many such cases, the Board may be able to report at once that the entire estate is one that may be sold direct.

59457. That is possible, but suppose you find on inspection that part of the estate is in such a condition that it cannot be allowed to pass direct, what is the Board to do then?—It comes back to the case we have been discussing.

59458. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—Surely you can do it now?—You cannot do it now.

59459. Is not it quite possible in such a case as the Dillon estate to take part of it, and fit it for sale much more quickly than the rest of the estate?—Yes, but you cannot sell until you become owner, and you must pay the purchase money before you become owner. One way to do it would be to give to the Board the same powers that the Estates Commissioners now have under section 6 of the Act of 1903, when portion of an estate is to be sold by direct sale, of having the sale agreements executed by landlords and tenants, the Board being responsible for the total price agreed upon. That would meet all the difficulties that have been raised, and the Board take over the portion of estates requiring treatment.

59460. CHAIRMAN.—Then our conversation has brought us to this. It is not feasible, so far as we can see, to divide an estate; that the estates within any specified area which it is suggested to give to Board must be sold as estates either to the Board or by direct sale?—The inspector might arrange that a certain number of the tenants should buy at a price amounting to, say, £10,000 by direct sale. The landlord is quite willing to do that. Section A then is to be sold for £10,000 direct, and is to be declared as a separate estate. Section B the Board proposes to buy for £40,000. The two sections are declared to be an estate at the same time, and the landlord is to get £10,000 with the bonus for one section, and to get £40,000, plus the bonus, for the other section.

59461. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—If you split it he has got to go to the tenants, and say to them, "Agree to buy"?—I have said all along that the price for both sections should be arranged at the same time.

59462. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—That is the key to the whole situation?—The agreement as to the amount the tenants will give must be a preliminary to fixing the price.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Then a certificate cannot be applied for until a landlord agrees with his tenants.

59463. CHAIRMAN.—If it is possible to split an estate then an arrangement between landlord and tenant must be arrived at before the vendor approaches the Board. He must come to the Board and say—"I have an estate, part of which is good land and part of which is land that no doubt requires treatment. I have arranged with my tenants to purchase the better land direct from me at a certain price." If you agree to buy the other part on the same day as you suggest, the estate is divided, the certificate is granted by the Board to carry out the arrangement made with the tenants on the one hand, and you purchase the other portion?—There would be no difficulty in doing that in a majority of cases.

CHAIRMAN.—That is the only way in which it can be done.

59464. Mr. BRYCE.—How can it be done without inspection?—It cannot be done without inspection.

59465. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It is not necessary before negotiating a bargain between the vendor and the Board that the tenants and the vendor have agreed on a price for the better portion. It will quite suffice if up to the time the Board and the vendor have agreed about the price for the whole estate the tenants have agreed as to the price at which they will buy?—That will suffice.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Then the landlord is to carry out a direct sale to the tenants through the Congested Districts Board. That is your proposition?

Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—No.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—The price of the whole estate is to be fixed between the landlord and the Congested Districts Board. That is ruling the decision of the landlord with regard to his tenants, whom the Board don't want to touch.

Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—That is not quite so. He would come to the Congested Districts Board, and say—"I can sell to my tenants, A, B, and C, for so much money. That being so, can I agree with you to buy the rest at such a price"?

59467. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Then the Congested Districts Board must give that price?—The price represented by his agreement with his tenants.

59468. CHAIRMAN.—Where is the inspection to come in under your proposal? I should have said before?—I have been viewing that proposal from what I know of the difficulties that usually arise. If the tenants enter into an agreement to purchase with the vendor before they approach the Board, the Board ought not to buy, because, as you have it in my evidence, once the tenants enter into agreements to purchase their holdings, and the Board subsequently buy the estate subject to the agreements, they have no power to deal with the estate, except under voluntary arrangements. The relation of landlord and tenant no longer subsists. They cannot enter upon the lands and applot turbary, make roads, or re-arrange holdings; so I have said all along, before the Board negotiate for the purchase of an estate the price should not be fixed between the landlord and tenant.

59469. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—That is easily understood: before negotiations begin the price cannot be fixed?—Not before the Board are invited to offer. There is a general desire now among the landlords in the West of Ireland to settle the price with their own tenants before they ask the Board to buy. The result is in the case of poor estates that the tenants are so anxious that the Board should purchase and spend money in improving the estate that they would agree to give two or more years' purchase for their holdings than they otherwise would. For this reason, and the reasons already stated, the Board in all cases object to purchase estates if the tenants have already entered into agreements to buy their holdings at a stated price. We have done it in a few cases, and we have had great trouble in dealing with the tenants.

59470. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—I don't think that anyone contemplates that being done under the new arrangement. Take the case in this way. The owner says that he is willing to sell his estate, and comes before an officer of the Congested Districts Board or before the Board itself for the purpose. The Board asks him what is his price.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

He names his price, it is tenanted land, *ex hypothesi*, or largely tenanted land. The Board's officer goes down and makes an inspection, and finds out what the tenants are willing to give for their holdings——

Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—All over the estate—both parts?

Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—More particularly on the part that must pass or may have to pass direct—indeed over the whole estate?—I would say over the whole estate.

59472. They also value or fix a value on the grass land. The Board says in these circumstances—"We are not able to give you more than such and such a sum for the entire estate, and it is apportioned in such and such a way on the different portions of the estate." Suppose they come to an agreement about the price, as has happened in the past, then the price is agreed on between them. It is a voluntary sale. The Board then says—"We require powers to allow some portions of that estate to pass straight to the tenants; other portions we must hold in our own hands." I take it that that in the main is your suggestion?—That, in substance, is one of my suggestions. Let the Board agree to buy the entire estate, and let them then declare each part of the property a separate estate, that is, the portion to be sold by direct sale, separate from the portion to be treated; and if the Board had the power which the Estates Commissioners now have of merely getting the tenants on the portion that does not need treatment to sign purchase agreements with the landlord for a price which the landlord agrees to accept, the purchase would be from the tenants to the landlord direct on that section of the estate through the intervention of the Congested Districts Board, as is done at present by the Estates Commissioners in cases coming under section 6 of the 1903 Act.

59473. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Do you mean that the landlord and the Congested Districts Board having come to an agreement on inspection, the landlord says he will sell for so much, and you agree that it is a fair price, then you divide this estate into two portions, one of which you are going to deal with, and the other of which is to go direct to the tenants—do you mean that the Congested Districts Board will do the rest, and secure to the landlords that the tenants do agree?—Yes.

59474. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—What about the date at which the inspection should come. As I understand the proposal which you are now considering, the question of inspection will raise no difficulty at all?—No. I don't see any difficulty raised by inspection but it must always take place before any answer can be given as to whether the estate is to be declared an estate in one or two sections.

59475. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Any objection based upon inspection goes out of it altogether if the landlord is to get the price agreed upon; and if the Congested Districts Board is to be responsible for the price agreed upon I don't care about inspection?—From the beginning that was the foundation of my suggestion, with this qualification—that at present the Board have no power to have any privity with these direct transactions, and they should consequently be allowed to exclude that portion of the estate from sale; but it might be made part of the Board's duty to arrange that undertakings to purchase at prices which amount to the total sum that the landlord agrees to accept are entered into for that portion to pass by direct sale while they agree to buy the remaining portion.

Mr. BRYCE.—It seems to me that the whole of this is really a dispute about words, because does not this mean that the whole sale is done, through the Congested Districts Board. The introduction of the question of direct sale is really not a matter of any importance at all; practically the Congested Districts Board become responsible.

Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It is a question of expeditious administration.

Mr. BRYCE.—It is a question of expeditious administration, and the only advantage of Mr. Doran's suggestion is as regards the margin of money that the Congested Districts Board has to deal with. Cannot that be provided for by saying that the amount of money, the £1,000,000, or whatever it is, shall be limited in its application to those cases where the Board is going to keep the land in hand for treatment, and that its margin should be increased *pro tanto* in proportion to the amount disposed of by direct sale.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—That practically stops direct sale, except through the Congested Districts Board.

Mr. BRYCE.—No sale should go through without inspection within the Board's area. The moment you introduce inspection you introduce the responsibility of the Congested Districts Board for the whole affair.

Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—Not in case there is no congestion. In the case of estates which are not to be treated, in which Mr. Doran does not want to do anything, he would want to assure himself beforehand that there was no necessity for treatment. It would not be inspection as regards price, but merely inspection to see whether the estate can be passed through, and handed over to the Estates Commissioners to deal with on the certificate.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Certainly.

59476. CHAIRMAN.—You remember that case in East Galway where a landlord had good land. He had also bad land somewhere else. There was a difficulty in that case, and he insisted on the Board buying both estates?—That is the Blake estate.

59477. Suppose that in that case the owner had not insisted on both properties being sold together with regard to the East Galway property there was nothing to do there?—No, except to give rise to any amount of trouble because we would not give it to sons of tenants.

59478. There was no improvement?—No.

59479. There was an estate which, if the man had not insisted on it being linked up with his tenanted estate, might be very well certified to pass direct.

Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It comes really to this—in addition to the untenanted land you acquire some fair land, which will pass in estates, and require no treatment.

59480. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—I agree with you personally as regards estates requiring treatment. Now let me come to your proposal as to estates requiring no treatment. Your idea is that the landlord should say to the Congested Districts Board that he is ready to sell. You agree with me that, perhaps, there is no treatment to be done. Are you going to arrange with the tenants what they are going to give, and are you going to leave the landlord, when you have inspected, in the position that nothing has been done? You find that nothing at all is required, but the landlord has not negotiated with the tenants. He knows his price, and you say, "Now, that is clear and you are at perfect liberty to sell." Are you going then to take the case up for the landlord, and arrange with the Estates Commissioners that he is to get that money? Do you arrange what the tenants are going to give?—No.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Then you stop the direct sale of all estates that don't require treatment.

59481. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—How is that?—What should be done is this: intending vendors of estates in counties containing congested districts should, in the first instance, before arranging any price with the tenants, apply to the Board to ascertain if the Board are prepared to declare the entire property to be an estate for direct sale. The Board, after a casual inspection, not an expensive one, will be able in many cases to declare such property an estate that might pass by direct sale. They then express their willingness to certify to that effect, which means that the landlord will negotiate direct, as at present, and the estate will pass through direct to the Estates Commissioners, as at present.

59482. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—I quite agree?—If they remain as at present with the relations of landlords and tenants, by requesting him to apply for a certificate before he fixes the price on the holdings, you would get over the difficulties that you were anticipating about price.

59483. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—What will be the proportion of congestion which will decide you in withholding that certificate or not? What would be the proportion of the estate requiring treatment that would induce you to keep the estate for yourself and not allow it to pass under certificate to the Estates Commissioners?—I would not like to fix any proportion, because I think if there was only one townland on an estate in rundale and in need of treatment, or one townland with several small holdings, that was near a grass farm, you would be justified in stipulating that that townland should not pass by direct sale.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

59484. Take it that there were 100 tenants on an estate, and that ten or five of them required rearrangement, would you keep that estate?—Your arrangements would be such that you would make these ten right, if they could be made right.

59485. You would have to buy that estate in order to do it?—Not under my proposal, if I made it clear.

59486. I certainly understood you to say that you would?—I would exclude the portion, big or small, that did not want treatment.

59487. You would have to buy the whole estate before you excluded?—If you have to buy the whole estate it will, in the case stated, mean a large transaction for small results

59488. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—You might have four or five tenants up and down the estate. Would you not allow that estate to pass direct?—Yes; but I am talking of a small section of the estate, such as a townland or so.

59489 Sir Antony MacDonnell.—I thought we had come to this conclusion: that without buying the estate and becoming the owners for the full price, you could not proceed to divide it up into sections, part of which can be sold off without any treatment and part of which requires treatment, and that it was on account of that that you would require a margin, and in regard to the portion to be passed through you would step into the position of the Estates Commissioners—you would be the broker between landlord and tenant?—Yes; but the Estates Commissioners don't actually become legal owners. In cases where the Board perform the function of brokers I suggest the Board would have purchase agreements signed between landlords and tenants covering the amount of purchase money agreed upon for the section of estate not needing treatment

59490. I thought we had come to this conclusion—that you have the right to buy or not to buy. If there is no treatment necessary you don't buy. You simply satisfy yourself that no treatment is necessary, and you give a certicate, and then the landlord deals with them as he does now, and deposits his agreements with the Estates Commissioners, or applies to the Estates Commissioners under section 6 to get them to buy the whole thing. If you buy an estate on which ninety-five do not want treatment and five do require treatment ,and become responsible to the landlord for the price, when the estate is vested in you and you have deposited your money you can divide that estate up into smaller sizes if you wish. You can say to the ninety-five tenants, "Come to an agreement" or they may have come to an agreement before you bought at all, then you ask them to carry out their agreement, and pass the land to the ninety-five straight off. There is no difficulty in that: you do it in two or three months, and you draw the money, and then you deal with the five who are left?—That seems to me to be a very objectionable arrangement altogether.

59491 Chairman.—I don't like to insist on what I am told is impossible, but in a case like what Sir Antony mentions, what is to prevent the Board from adopting the plan which I suggested half an hour ago? What is to prevent the Board saying, "Our inspection has shown us that there is a certain proportion of congestion on this estate which prevents us at present from giving a certificate that it is an estate which can pass from landlord to tenant. You have in a corner of an estate a little patch of congestion. This may be remedied, and if you can, with regard to nine-tenths of your property, arrange satisfactory terms with your tenants, then come to us and show us that these terms have been arrived at, we will then certify with regard to nine-tenths of your property that it is an estate which can pass direct, and on your then proceeding to a sale with your tenants on the nine-tenths we will undertake at the same time to purchase the one-tenth which is congested"?—The suggestion which I have made is that the terms of purchase should be simultaneously arranged for both sections of the estate

59492. I venture to say it comes back to what I said. You must withhold your certificate in that case until the man has arranged with his tenants. You may say, "Go away, and make your arrangements with your tenants"?—I did not suggest that you should do that.

59493 Sir Francis Mowatt.—In the transaction, as to the part of the land that you can pass direct, are you contemplating that the Board, before they accept shall satisfy themselves that the prices are correct prices for those tenants to pay? You are discussing now the price of an estate, part of which can pass direct and part of which must be treated, and the proposal, roughly, is you should say to the landlord, "Settle with your tenants the price of the part that is passing direct and we will give our certificate as regards that price." Do you contemplate before giving that certificate that the Congested Districts Board should have approved of the price which the tenants have to pay?—No It rests with the Estates Commissioners to approve of the prices in cases of direct sale.

59494. Chairman.—Personally, I would say that they have nothing to do with the matter?—In the case just mentioned what would happen is, it would be a direct sale, and the agreements would pass, as now, to the Estates Commissioners. Their function in relation to the agreements would be to have the non-zone cases inspected by their inspector, and reported on as to security.

Sir John Colomb —You are assuming that the landlord agrees with his tenant before he applies to the Congested Districts Board.

Chairman —The only way, then, is this: a landlord comes to the Board, and says, "I am anxious to sell my estate direct; will you certify that I can do so"? The Board then proceeds to have that casually inspected, and discovers that 80 per cent. of the estate or 70 per cent. or any figure you like as in a condition which can pass direct, but that 20 or 30 per cent contains congested holdings, which must be improved. If the Board certifies that the whole of the estate is to pass, then the 20 or 30 per cent. suffers. I mean that the Board has no opportunity of improving them. They may be a small proportion, still, whatever their number is, they don't get their circumstances improved. I would say that the Board should say to this landlord, "We find 20 or 30 per cent. of your estate is in this condition, and, therefore, we cannot certify at present that it is in a fit condition to pass direct; but go away and make agreements with your tenants, with regard to this 70 per cent , and we will deal with the rest of them." You would then show him on the map the portion of the estate that you would certify for direct sale and the portion that you wanted to buy.

Sir Francis Mowatt —"Go away, and make arrangements with your tenants with regard to that 70 per cent., if you can do so; then come back to us, and if we can then make a satisfactory arrangement with you with regard to the other 30 per cent. we will certify that your 70 per cent. portion can pass direct, and we will take over the 30 per cent."

Sir John Colomb—Is there the slightest hope of being able to arrange with the 70 per cent. when the others are going to get the benefit of the Congested Districts Board's interference?

Chairman —Why not?

Sir John Colomb —This is the state of mind of the tenants. The Congested Districts Board is coming to deal with portion of the estate It will set them all agog. They will hold on until they see what benefits the congested people are going to get, and the moment the Congested Districts Board have done anything they will open their mouths wider.

Mr. Sutherland —Are you referring to the landlords?

Sir John Colomb.—No; the tenants

Mr. Kavanagh —It might cut both ways.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—What becomes, Mr. Doran, of the necessity of road making, turbary, and drainage if 70 per cent passes out of your hands altogether, and 30 per cent. remains? How will you arrange about all these?

59495. Chairman —That may be a reason which would prevent the Board from certifying?—When you indicate on the map beforehand the portion of the estate you wish to purchase for treatment you will exclude all holdings of that kind—holdings affected by roads and drains.

59496. Sir Antony MacDonnell —The whole estate may draw its turf from one bog?—Of course it would naturally draw it from one bog if it was in the neighbourhood.

59497. Chairman —It seems to me then that if it is of such a character that it was a bog centre which would affect the whole estate you would have to buy the whole estate?—It was suggested that the Board might in all such cases arrange the price for the estate, if they had power to carry out the sale in this way, to get undertakings to purchase from tenants of all

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

holdings on the estate which they did not need to interfere with and declare that to be a separate estate for direct sale from the landlord to the tenant, and the Board should take over the remainder of the estate at the balance of the gross price agreed to be paid to the landlord.

59498. It seems to me that the difficulty of that plan is this, that you are then really taking the negotiations out of the hands of the landlord altogether?—If you object to that, I am negotiating with you for the entire. I take the responsibility of settling with the individual tenants and lodging undertakings and you must get the balance of your purchase money.

59499 The landowner may not be satisfied with the purchase price?—Then if not, there is no way but to buy out the entire estate.

59500. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Take the case you have made. In that case the Board would consult with the tenants to ascertain what has been passing between the tenants and the owner, and the Board and the owner have come to an agreement about the price. That is the case you are making?—Yes. On the gross.

59501. In that case I take it what you are anxious for is this, that the Board having ascertained the price which the tenants are willing to give and having come to an agreement with the owner as to the price which he is to get on the gross, should have power to arrange, so that a certain amount of the property will pass direct to the tenants and another portion of the property pass direct to the Congested Districts Board?—Yes

59502. That is how you sum up your idea about how the thing would mainly work out in practice?—Yes, and my only objection to taking over the entire purchase is that it will so increase the volume of property to be dealt with by the Board that it will make the rate of progress in dealing with the areas that need treatment extremely slow.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—It comes to this: I think we cannot ignore the definition of congestion altogether.

Chairman.—It does not seem to me to affect the question at all. How is the definition of congestion going to help you here in the least?

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—It will indicate at once what estates you ought to buy.

Chairman.—It will indicate that on certain estates there are poverty and congestion.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—It will indicate also that the poverty is a negligible quantity if you so regulate the definition of congestion.

Chairman.—A negligible quantity means, however you try to get out of it that you are prepared to sacrifice a certain number of tenants.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—I think it a *reductio ad absurdum* that in order to improve the condition of five tenants you are to buy the holdings of 500

59503 Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—I don't see that this is a question which affects our definition of congestion at all. I would agree with Sir Antony MacDonnell in leaving the five men in their present condition, leaving them to be improved in some other way. There are many such people in all parts of Ireland and I don't see how it affects the definition of congestion What difficulty is there in the supposition that the owner and the Congested Districts Board, after the tenants have been consulted, would in voluntary agreement agree about the price for the whole estate, and that the Congested Districts Board would in future have the power which the Estates Commissioners possess of allowing portion of that estate to pass direct to the tenants and keeping the other portion in hand for improvement? Is not that the whole thing?—That is the whole case. You can declare any portion of a property to be an "estate."

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—When your lordship said you agreed with me in regard to the remaining tenants I think your lordship admitted in principle the importance of the definition of congestion in regard to estates, and you ought to have a principle which would regulate your not buying particular estates and buying others.

Most Rev Dr. O'Donnell.—I hope you would agree with me that no matter how efficient the improving authority is it cannot propose to itself to eliminate every single uneconomic holding in each district.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—That is my reason for raising this question. If you don't have some definition of congestion you will empower the authority to deal with every single case of congestion that may arise.

Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—And it would be for the authority not to touch in this way the relief of congestion except in case of an appreciable area on the estate.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—That is the principle I am contending for.

Chairman.—Obviously if there are a few tenants scattered about the estate who are in a very poor condition it would be very difficult to pick them out from the estate, but if there is a townland or a corner of an estate in a very congested condition which needs improvement, is not it perfectly possible to arrive at a plan by which the 95 per cent of that property shall pass direct, and the Board take over that 5 per cent? Is not that possible?

Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Quite possible

59503a. Chairman.—And it seems to me perfectly indefensible, if an estate of that sort exists, with a little townland in a corner of it, with five or six or ten tenants in a very poor condition, to sacrifice those tenants?—It is usually the case that where there is a mixed estate with some very poor holdings the poor holdings are usually clustered together in portion of the area.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—They won't pass uncared for. If they were only 5 per cent, say, scattered up and down according to his lordship the bishop, and, as I understand, according to you——

Chairman.—My point is that the poor tenants are all lying together.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—If there was an estate consisting of 100 tenants, with five tenants having uneconomic holdings in a corner, your lordship would still, as I understand the matter, give a certificate that that estate should be passed through the Estates Commissioners?

Chairman.—I should bar that townland

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—Why bar that townland because the Estates Commissioners are competent to deal with that townland?

Chairman.—That raises the question whether the Board and the Commissioners are to operate in the same area.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—That is a point, but I want to point out that if the Congested Districts Board retain that estate for the sake of improving that small area they will be spending money and spending time and enlarging enormously the problem with which they have to deal, while there is another agency equally well adapted for the purpose of such small work as that.

59504. Chairman.—That little townland has got to go into the possession of some body to be improved, and has got to go into the possession of the Estates Commissioners or the Congested Districts Board The rest of the property, although it goes through the agency of the Estates Commissioners, does not actually pass into the possession of the Estates Commissioners?—That is the point.

Chairman.—They are the main conduit pipe between the landlord and the tenants

59505. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—With reference to those five, I think if they happen to be in a townland such as Lord Dudley contemplated, would not it be your view when the Congested Districts Board had arrived with the owner at an understanding about price, the Board would allow the 95 per cent. to pass direct, the formalities being done by the Estates Commissioners, and declare a congested estate the land on which the five were situated, and in that way reserve the five for treatment?—Yes.

59506. They could do that now?—Yes. They could schedule the land as a congested estate, and lose the ten per cent. What I have thought of that is that it would be very much more desirable that the Congested Districts Board should be responsible for the carrying through of the purchase perhaps of an estate which was to be divided into two sections, one being scheduled for direct sale, and the other for sale by the landlord to the Board; that the Board should get agreements signed by the tenants, and become responsible to the landlord for payment of the agreed price, which there would be no difficulty in doing in practice We get undertakings lodged with the Estates Commissioners to cover the price agreed upon for Section A.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

59507. Sir Francis Mowatt.—You apprehend that if the Congested Districts Board were to buy estates on which only a small portion is congested, that will naturally use up very much faster the £1,000,000 a year which was suggested for dealing with the congested parts?—Yes. It would encumber the Board's administration to some extent.

59508. Whether the non-congested portions of an estate are purchased through the Land Commission, or whether they are purchased through the Congested Districts Board, the expenses will equally fall upon the same fund?—Quite so.

59509. Therefore, as regards the total expenditure, in dealing with those lands it will be the same in the one case as in the other, subject only to the Congested Districts Board in case of the removal of the Estates Commissioners. So I don't see, subject to any explanation you may now give, why the total charge upon the fund out of which the purchase is to take place will be increased, because the purchase is made by the Congested Districts Board, and not by the Estates Commissioners?—As regards the portions of the estate not needing treatment, the Congested Districts Board's expenses of administration would be increased in a small proportion, but to that extent only that would be necessary to cover the cost of preparing and completing the sale agreements and to pass them through the Sales Department.

59509a. Mr. Bryce.—But you are not going to pass them through?—Yes.

59510. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Out of the Land Purchase Fund must be found in any case the purchase money for those properties?—Yes.

59511. If the improvement costs something to the Congested Districts Board under the proposed scheme it would have cost a corresponding amount to the other authority?—Certainly.

59512. Sir Francis Mowatt.—I don't see, therefore, that this change in arrangement increases the total annual charge which would fall upon the State Fund?—Certainly not. It won't increase it at all; but some confusion of ideas appears to have occurred in the discussion, from the fact that I was expressing my opinions altogether in view of the suggestion made to the Commission, that the output of the Board would be £1,000,000 a year, and in order to make the administration as effective as possible as regards the relief of congestion, I considered it very desirable that they should not purchase estates, or substantial portions of estates, that they could not substantially improve, and that it would be an incumbrance to the Board's administration to be obliged to undertake the function of supervising direct sales, which could be done by the Estates Commissioners, as at present.

59513. Sir John Colomb.—You see no objection to the Congested Districts Board within the area of operations being the conduit pipe?—No, if you don't apply the output limit of a million a year to such estates, I see no objection whatever.

Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—As Sir Francis pointed out to you, it is very much the same thing whether the zone is on one side of the line or the other.

Sir John Colomb.—The whole thing that is exercising my mind is what effect is the operation that is suggested going to have on stopping direct sale? My mind is not clear at all on that.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—Assuming that to be the case, that you may stop direct sale, won't you, *pari passu*, increase the number of sales of land at an identical price, only it will be through the Congested Districts Board instead of being direct? The same amount of land will be sold, the same price will be paid, but instead of many cases of direct sales from landlord to tenant, the Congested Districts Board will buy *in globo* all estates, any portion of which need treatment.

Sir John Colomb.—The sales will be all under section 6, or, at all events, *in globo*.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—Yes.

Chairman.—I still personally cannot understand why it should be impossible to divide an estate. If the suggestion that was proposed some time ago were adopted, Sir John says that there would be no chance of getting the tenants to agree. Upon that I cannot express an opinion. Sir John says that, and I don't know whether you agree with him, but I cannot understand why it should be so.

Mr. Kavanagh.—There would be great difficulty

59514. Chairman.—Then, suppose that it does come to this, that you have to buy the estate *in globo*, what difficulty is there in saying to the landlord, "Go and arrange your terms with 70 per cent. of your tenants, and then come back, and we will undertake to take the rest"?—There would be no difficulty, as far as I know, in carrying out a sale to make it a condition that where the Board declared a portion of the estate needed treatment, to oblige the Board to be responsible to secure to vendor the total price agreed for the entire estate. That was suggested a moment ago.

59515. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—If you do that you will quite meet Mr Kavanagh's point. Mr. Kavanagh does not want a conveyance to the Board. All he wants is agreement as to price?—Yes; precisely the same procedure as the Estates Commissioners now apply. They inspect an estate They find that a certain section of the estate, it may be 10 out of 100, come within the definition of congested estate. On the re sale of that they can lose a certain percentage, and pass the r mainder of the estate by direct sale. If the Board decided that portion of an estate is such as should be subjected to treatment, there would be no difficulty if the Board arrange with vendor the total price, getting undertakings signed by tenants and vendor in respect of those parts of the estate which they desire to pass as a separate estate by direct sale.

59516. Mr Kavanagh.—That meets my point altogether?—In practice there is no difficulty in that. It will get over Sir John's difficulty also.

59517. Chairman.—That contemplates, does it not, that there should be advances beyond the million? You would suggest that those holdings with regard to which the Board got any undertakings should not be included in the million?—They should not.

59518. And the sales in these cases should be treated as direct sales?—Yes.

59519. And should not be included in the million given the Board?—They should not.

59520. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—The million is to be the cost of land?—The proposed sale price of land per year.

59521. Chairman.—If you depart from your million does not it lead us into great complication? To begin with, how do we know how much of this land outside would be purchased? We don't know what amount of money outside the million would be required by the Board. That is one difficulty. It is impossible for us to earmark any particular sum for that?—At present I don't see any objection to depositing those undertakings in the ordinary way with the Estates Commissioners, and letting them deal directly with the vesting, as they must eventually do in any case. I see no difficulty about sending in agreements to cover a certain section of the estate, and letting the Estates Commissioners deal with that portion of the estate which is in a normal condition, the same as they do with estates no portion of which needs treatment.

59522. Sir John Colomb.—Would not that involve the Estates Commissioners sending inspectors down?—There is no objection to that that I can see.

59523. Chairman.—That would be a double inspection?—No They would be only inspecting as to boundaries and security of non-zone holdings, as they do now in cases of direct sale.

59524. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—No The agreement has been made by you and then submitted to the Estates Commissioners?—The agreements would not be between the Board and the tenants, because the Board are not yet owners

59525. Between whom would they be?—Between the owner and the tenant, the Board being merely an agent, or negotiators, who say to vendor, "We value one section of the estate at £10,000, and the gross estate at £100,000. We propose, and undertake, to get agreements lodged in respect of one section of the estate for £10,000 Then we will pay you £90,000 for the remainder, so securing you £100,000, which you agreed to take for the entire estate."

59526. If the Estates Commissioners send down an inspector, who says, "We don't consider that this is sufficient security," what is to happen?—The agreements lodged are to be subject to such provision as apply to all cases of direct sale.

59527. You would have made an agreement with the landlord?—As regards the portion of estate to be sold direct, the Board's responsibility ends on obtaining agreements from the tenants and vendor to purchase their holdings at the prices agreed, provided that the agreements are accepted by the Estates Commissioners.

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

59528. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Do you mean that the gross price settled between the Congested Districts Board and the landlords may be subject to the review of the Estates Commissioners also? Surely, that makes the landlord worse off than ever?—I don't see why it should. All agreements for direct sale are, at present, subject to these conditions.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—It brings in the Estates Commissioners to review the price given by the Congested Districts Board

CHAIRMAN.—There would be double inspection. Your people would have to inspect first of all in order to fix a price, so that they could say to the landlord, "We will undertake to get you agreements as regards £10,000." You would have to found that agreement upon advice given to you by your inspectors, and then, having done all that, the Estates Commissioners would send down the inspectors in order to review what you had done.

59529. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—Are not your valuers valuers from the Land Commission?—No.

59530. They are supposed to be in future?—Only in respect of untenanted lands and holdings not subject to judicial tenancies.

59531. CHAIRMAN.—We had agreed that the inspection should be done by Land Commission valuers?—That being so, the Estates Commissioners would not alter the price.

59532 Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—They would be not paid for inspection but valuation for the Estates Commissioners?—They inspect our holdings, and spend a large amount of money on the inspection.

59534. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—Not the Estates Commissioners. That is the Land Commission—an entirely different thing?—The Estates Commission is a department of the Land Commission.

59535. They don't inspect for security, these men who come down to look after your affairs. They merely inspect for occupation. It is done under Commissioner Lynch as a preliminary to recording the price of it?—They inspect for occupation, although the estate bailiff or other person with local knowledge swears an affidavit within ten days of date of vesting holding that tenant-purchaser is in occupation.

Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—That does not interfere with you at all. They don't clash with you.

59536. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—What percentage of the purchase money is represented by inspection? What does it cost—one-half per cent.?—I could not say. I think that the inspection in these scattered cases costs a great deal. The Land Commission could tell the cost.

Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—The Estates Commissioners' outdoor staff, all told, costs £12,000 a year.

Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—How much land do they inspect in a year?

Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—They have paid out £19,000,000 in four years.

59537 Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—Their cost would be £48,000 in four years, for that amount of land would be very small. It is hardly worth considering?—I am aware that a very large proportion of the estates in respect of which agreements have been lodged are not yet inspected.

Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—That money has been paid out.

59538. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—You are talking about the landlord and the Congested Districts Board agreeing to a gross price subject to review. The landlord in agreeing to this price would not know whether he was going to get it or not. It would not be a firm offer?—It would not on my first statement, but if the suggestion were acted on that all the untenanted lands and non-judicial holdings on an estate should be valued by the Land Commission, the statutory rent-fixing body, the Board could make a firm offer, because the price would not be liable to deduction.

59539. CHAIRMAN.—If the Estates Commissioners would not take the price as fixed?—Unless the zone limit be abolished I don't think they would have the power to object.

59540 Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—Would there be any difficulty about that subsequent valuation in the future more than exists now with reference to sales to tenants by the Congested Districts Board?—The Congested Districts Board up to the present has been obliged to guarantee against default of annuities on all the sales. That guarantee should not be applied to the larger volume of work you now propose, because it is an accumulating liability every year, and would seriously affect the Board's financial position in the course of a few years.

59541. You would suggest then that the valuation by the officer of the Land Commission should be taken itself as sufficient to satisfy in the case of the sale subsequently from the owners or the Congested Districts Board to the tenants?—Yes. I would say where the prices fixed were within the zone limits as applied to judicial holdings, or rents assessed by the Land Commission valuers as equivalent to judicial rents that they could not alter the price.

59542. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—If you are within the zone limits the Estates Commissioners would have to accept, but where you are not within the zone limits, with non-judicial rents and so on, would you have the Estates Commissioners accept, without any challenge, the recommendations of the valuers?—The Land Commission valuers.

59543. They don't do that now. You make the report of the subordinate binding upon his superior?—I think it is rather absurd myself to assume that a person sitting in an office in Dublin knows more about the value than a man who walks the land

59544. There are diverse valuations?—Yes, but a person in Dublin who has not seen the holding can't be a judge of its value.

59545. It is the judgment of a man whose judgment is trained by long experience. It is not a whim?—How can that be? I hear it is a common thing to alter the valuer's estimate, but I don't see any justification for thinking that a person, no matter how experienced, who never saw the holding, can form a better judgment on its value than the valuer, who inspected it, especially when he is a man stated to be selected for his competence as a valuer.

59546. You know perfectly well that two valuers do not agree?—I say that the opinion of either is better than that of a man who never saw the place.

59547. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I think there will be difficulties in any half-way house in the question of buying estates?—That being so I think I may repeat what I have said already that there is practically no difficulty in the way of the Board undertaking to pass those cases through provided the cost is not included in the proposed output of a million, and that the necessary expenditure to cover the administrative duty is provided.

CHAIRMAN.—There again you increase your staff to an extent which, so far as I can understand, is not estimable. These conduit pipe duties will necessitate a staff, and how big that staff will be and what it will cost we cannot estimate.

Mr. BRYCE.—Sir Francis Mowatt has just shown that the cost will be very small as regards inspection.

Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—It is about 5 shillings per cent. for inspection.

Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—It will be more than that, because as Mr. Callan has just pointed out to me in most direct sales it is not inspection of land for value; it is only inspection for occupation. The actual inspection of land is only in regard to sales under section 6 to the Estates Commissioners, and sales under section 5 where the question of price between landlord and tenant comes in. So if you had it as you now propose to have it the actual inspection and valuation of the land would be greater

Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—Possibly, but as far as the figures go it would be a small proportion on the purchase of an estate.

59548. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—Whatever the administrative difficulties or wherever the valuers come from, in the suggestion that there would be a valuation from the Estates Commissioners there is nothing new; it is only that the valuation is done under new auspices. It would be done if no arrangement such as is now contemplated were carried through?—No matter what body does it, all these things which we are discussing must be done by some one body. Some one body must separate estates needing treatment from those not needing it.

59549. CHAIRMAN.—Would you exclude the whole of the estates which don't need treatment at all? Don't you think that £1,000,000 a year for the rest of them would be an adequate provision to make? Don't you think that that would mean that the estates would pass through within a reasonable number of years?—It is very difficult to estimate it, but on the figures that Mr. Callan prepared it would take a considerable time

59550. It would not take more than 25 years?—About that—from 17 to 30 millions' worth of property.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

CHAIRMAN.—That is excluding all the estates which don't need improvement at all and including all the estates where even small improvements are necessary?

Mr Callan.—Yes. Mr. Doran made an estimate, necessarily a rough estimate, that if you exclude estates which do not need improvement you would exclude one-fourth of the area.

Witness.—You would allow one-fourth of the area to pass through. That was a rough estimate.

59552. CHAIRMAN.—If we admit we cannot get over this difficulty of dividing the estates, if we say we won't attempt it, and merely have the two classes, those estates which can be certified by the Board as being absolutely free from congestion, and the other class where there is congestion which the Board must be prepared to buy *in globo*, even though there may be only 10 per cent. of congestion; then we are forced to admit that the problem may take more than from 17 to 30 years to settle at £1,000,000 a year?—It would, if estates, or portions of estates, that don't need treatment are included in the output of £1,000,000 a year.

Mr. BRYCE.—Surely it will be one-fourth of the whole, if Mr Callan's estimate is that one-fourth of the whole does not require treatment.

Mr Callan.—In the whole of the area which it was suggested might be assigned to the Board there are, in round numbers, 180 000 holdings. The valuation of those holdings is under £2,200 000. Of the 180,000 holdings close on 70,000 have either been sold or agreed to be sold. That leaves 110,000 holdings that remain to be sold. That is to say, of 180 000 holdings eleven-eighteenths remain unsold, and seven-eighteenths have been sold, or agreed to be sold. If you reduce the valuation of the 180,000 holdings which is just under £2,200,000, by seven-eighteenths, that leaves, roughly, £1,300,000. That is to say, 110,000 holdings remain to be sold at a valuation which is estimated at £1,300,000. If all that land passed at 20 years' purchase it would be a matter of £26,000,000, and at the rate of £1,000,000 a year the process would take 26 years. If 30 years' purchase were given, £39,000,000 would be required, and then it would take 39 years at the rate of £1,000,000 a year. In either case the amount that would be sold by the Board is over-stated, and therefore the time is over-stated. There is a certain amount which would not be purchased by the Board because it does not need treatment. It was suggested in the estimate submitted to the Commission that that would be additional to the £1,000,000 a year. Mr Doran says, as a very rough estimate, that the amount of land which might be certified for direct sale would be one fourth. Therefore if 20 years' purchase was the average price instead of £26,000 000 being required for sales through the Congested Districts Board it would be only three-quarters of that, which would be under £20,000,000, which, at £1,000 000 a year, would take less than 20 years. And again, if the price ran up to 30 years' purchase you would exclude the one-fourth of £39 000,000. That would bring it down to under £30,000,000, which would mean under 30 years. That is how those original estimates were made.

59553. If the Board were to deal with land at the rate of £1,000,000 a year you think that it would increase your outdoor staff by £30,000 a year?—Yes, if £1,000,000 a year were applied to purchase of estates that needed treatment. In respect of those, the cost of my staff would be increased by £30,000 a year.

59554. If £1,000,000 a year is to go on estates that require treatment, that will increase the expenses of your outdoor staff by £30,000 a year?—Yes; and the additional duty in relation to portions of estates to pass by direct sale would increase the expenses only in small proportion.

59555. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—If we take it you want £30,000 a year in addition to your present income for the treatment of land needing treatment I would ask Mr Doran what class of expenditure for staff would be needed on the land which passes direct to the tenants; it would be altogether different from the expenditure on the million's worth of land?—The expenditure would only be the same as if it passed through the Estates Commissioners—administrative.

59557. Try now to add what you think that amount will be to your £30 000 a year which you require additional in order to pass a million's worth of property that is ameliorated. How do you add for the property that is not improved? Take half a million's worth of that property or a million's worth of it what additional expenditure will they need on staff for that process?—There would be no expenditure, except that incurred in connection with the preparation and lodging of the maps and agreements, such as the Estates Commissioners have to incur in cases of direct sale.

59558. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—What would you put that at?—I have no basis for an estimate, except what Sir Antony stated as to cost of dealing with £19 000,000 worth of property paid for under Act of 1903.

59559. Would another £10,000 do it?—I should think that amount ample.

59560. Then allowing very liberally it would be £40,000 a year?—Yes.

59561. CHAIRMAN.—Will you go on, Mr. Doran?—In the particulars of loss* which I have prepared I only include the estates which have either been sold or are ready for sale. There are a great many others in course of treatment which are not yet ready for sale. The estates to which I refer are classified as follows:—Class A.—Poor tenanted estates on some of which there was a small proportion of untenanted land available for migration and the enlargement of small holdings. Class B.—Very poor tenanted estates on which there was practically no agricultural land available for migration and enlargement of holdings, and upon which the improvements effected were mainly re-arrangement of the holdings, improvement of buildings, road-making, and drainage. Class C.—Migration estates comprised wholly or mainly of untenanted land used chiefly for migration. The total purchase price of estates A, B, and C is £317,639, and the total amount spent in improvement works is £81,249, and the total net loss £41,152. The total poor law valuation is £12,457, and the total area is 53,627 acres, of which 10,558 acres were untenanted, and 43,069 acres were tenanted. Class A comprises 76·1 per cent. of the gross purchase money. This class, comprising poor estates, on some of which there was a small proportion of land available for migration and enlargement, were the estates that incurred the least loss for effecting a substantial amount of improvement in the condition of the occupier. Class B comprises 15·6 per cent. of the gross purchase money. Class B estates are those classified as being very poor, which need a large outlay to make any change in their condition, and where there was little or no land available for enlargement. The only improvements effected for the large outlay were improvement of dwellings, re-arranging the holdings, and making roads and drains. The Board have not materially increased the number of economic holdings.

59562. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—That is Class B?—Yes; such a place as Carna, in Galway, or similar estates. That would be amongst the poorest of that class perhaps. Class C comprises only 8·3 per cent. of the gross purchase money; that is untenanted land. Of the estates purchased under the Act of 1903, which are now ready for sale or sold, speaking in round figures, three-fourths of the land dealt with was Class A, poor estates, where there was considerable room for development and improvement by drainage and road-making, the improvement of dwellings, consolidation of holdings, and, to some extent, by migration and enlargement of holdings. I would put the Dillon Estate in that category, and the De Freyne Estate would be included in the same class. Class B would be represented by those poor estates round about Mallaranny and similar poor tenanted lands elsewhere, which, no matter how much you spend on them, you cannot so improve that the people could live on the land alone.

59563. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—The expenditure in that case is very largely on houses?—Frequently. Where there are rundale holdings it is very largely striping the holdings the land usually being of such a poor character that you cannot charge such outlay to the land. It costs more to fence in a twenty-acre holding, half of which is rock, than it will to fence through arable land. In the one case you may be able to charge the land with the outlay, in the other case you cannot.

59564. CHAIRMAN.—Class C seems to me to be very important?—Yes.

59565. But apparently you have only bought 8 per cent of it out of the £317,000 you have spent on land purchased?—These lists do not represent all of what we have bought. I am only giving you actual figures of estates we have ready for sale or have sold under Act of 1903.

59566. Only 8 per cent is grass land?—Only 8 per cent. is estates wholly or mainly untenanted.

* See p. 46.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

59567. That shows that there has been extremely little migration work done in comparison with your other work?—Comparatively speaking, yes.

59568. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—You may say absolutely, because the migration work has been extremely small. I think we had better face that fact?—We will come on to it. You can ask me any question you like it afterwards. The total area of Class C is 3,000 acres of land.

59569. CHAIRMAN.—Grass land?—Yes.

59570. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—You have got 10,000 acres of untenanted land at the bottom of the first page of your memorandum. You give a total area of 53,627 acres, of which 10,538 were untenanted?—Altogether untenanted land, but there would be untenanted land in A as well.

59571. This is the whole lot?—Yes; but I am talking of C alone now.

59572. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—You are talking of the area of land to which migrants have been moved?—I am talking of untenanted land included in C. A contains some untenanted land. B contains little or none. C is practically altogether untenanted land. 10,000 acres is the area of the untenanted land included in A, B, and C. The percentage of loss on the treatment of estates was as follows:—Class A 9·4 per cent. of the cost price of the estate, Class B 21·6 per cent. of the cost price of the estate; Class C 28·8 per cent. of the cost price of the estate. That is to say, Class A was put through hands at a comparatively small loss, being estates capable of considerable development, containing some untenanted land, and not being the poorest class of tenanted estates. In Class C, which was altogether migration, the loss was 28·8 per cent. The average loss upon A, B, and C was 12·9 per cent.

59573. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—Can you tell me the extent of Class C?—I hand in a schedule* which shows it. The average loss on all three classes was 12·9 per cent.

59574. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—What is the statutory limit to what you are allowed to spend on estates?—There is no limit; but you are now in search of some information that will enable you to base an opinion as to the average loss which the Board might sustain in dealing with, say, a million's worth of property per year, and I give you these particulars in the hope that they may assist you. You have, in lists A, B, C, in round figures one-third of a million's worth of typical estates.

59575. Are you satisfied that this 12·9 or, say, 13 per cent. would be sufficient all over to meet demands?—No. I would rather you would allow me to finish my memorandum before I answer that. You have here the information that in dealing with these estates, the cost price of which was nearly one-third of a million, £317,000, the average loss was 12·9 per cent.; but you have to analyse the character of the estates that make up the group. That is very important.

59576. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—You would not say that sufficient relief has been given in the case of the Class A estates?—No.

59577. Consequently if we aim at the relief which we ought to give it will be very much more than 12 per cent.?—Very much more. That is why I think it so necessary to emphasise the classification. When you come to analyse this group, on which the average loss is 12·9 per cent., you find that 75 per cent. of it is estates which needed treatment, but which responded to treatment like the Dillon estate, and on that 75 per cent. the average loss was only 9 per cent. on the purchase money; but when you came to settling migrants and dealing with them as economically as possible, the loss was nearly thirty per cent.

59578. May I take it that 75 per cent. was not improved to the extent to which you would be glad to improve it?—It is not at all brought up to the extent that anyone could say is satisfactory, but we have done a lot of useful work on these estates.

59579. Consequently you cannot say that the 9 per cent. is any indication of what the loss would be in the future probably?—No, under more satisfactory treatment.

Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—On the assumption that you are going to make it a perfect job?

Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—A considerably larger number of people should have been migrated than you were able to do.

59581. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Also you were restricted in this way, that you could only deal with properties that were offered to you, and that the outlay and expenditure there are not quite the same as where you have the power of acquiring property generally?—Yes. That is very important.

59582. Therefore, this is dealing with the loss on properties dealt with under circumstances that are going to be changed?—Yes; that ought to be changed.

59583. Therefore, this is no real guide to the loss and expenditure where the Congested Districts Board have powers to acquire property wherever it is wanted for the relief of congestion?—It is not an absolute guide, but it does afford you, as I think you will see later on, reliable data for arriving at an opinion in the matter.

59584. What I mean is that in Class A the loss is only 9·4 per cent. You were simply reduced to that because you could not do anything else?—We did all we could for those estates under present conditions.

59585. You could not take any large portions of Class C in relief of Class A?—We had not much of Class C. We did all we could for Class A, having regard to the number of people who were willing to leave these estates. Only a very small proportion of them would migrate to the lands we could offer. We did not refuse to migrate anyone who would migrate to the lands available; but we had so little land on hands that intending migrants had but a small area to select from. Some of these estates are quite near grass farms that we had no power to acquire, and we had to sell a considerable number of uneconomic holdings, although grass farms were near them.

59586. CHAIRMAN.—You say you did your best with the amount of grass land available. What was the chief reason that you had no more grass land?—We could only endeavour to buy those that were offered to us, and we did buy most of them.

59587. You were not handicapped with want of funds?—No.

59588. You had plenty of funds to buy if you got the landlords to sell?—I think so. At least we have never come to that point when we were told that there was no money to pay for estates.

59589. Take the Dillon Estate. If you had compulsory powers that would have enabled you to buy more grass land, do you think you would have been able to have migrated more people?—Yes; if we could have got the lands that we would have selected, say, within ten miles or so of the estate.

59590. If you had compulsory powers to enable you to purchase grass lands suitable for migration, you think you would have been able to prevail upon more people to migrate on that estate?—I am quite sure. In fact, I believe that a number of the Dillon people will migrate if the Board can get lands within ten miles. Several of them have already applied for holdings on grass lands purchased within the past two years.

59591. That would enable you to make a better job on the Dillon Estate?—Yes.

59592. Would it also increase the amount of your loss?—We dealt with the Dillon Estate without any loss, and the Dillon Estate, being half the volume of the work completed, up to a date mentioned in my evidence at your first sittings, had the effect of reducing the average percentage of loss to 6 per cent. on all the estates dealt with, simply because half the volume cost nothing.

59593. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It does not come into these figures at all?—No.

59594. CHAIRMAN.—It is not fair to take the Dillon Estate as an example?—On the other hand, here are 75 per cent. of the cost price of the estates dealt with under Act of 1903, some of the Dillon Estate type, and our loss is 9 per cent.

59595. I suppose the same handicap applies all round?—Yes.

59596. If you had compulsory powers to obtain grass lands in the neighbourhood of these estates you would have been able to migrate greater numbers of people?—Yes.

59597. The loss, therefore, would have been greater?—Yes, but the results would have been more satisfactory.

59598. If you had compulsory powers from the beginning your loss would have been more than 9 per cent. with regard to the 75 per cent. in value of estates?—Yes; and it will be more if the Board put them into anything approaching a satisfactory condition. It is only where the condition of the people is slightly ameliorated that the loss can be small.

* See p. 46.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Where you have to apply radically ameliorative treatment to poor tenanted estates, like portion of the Armstrong Estate and others, it is only where there happens to be a large area of grass land on the estate that you can enlarge all uneconomic holdings, and make a really satisfactory settlement without a large loss.

59599. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—What was your loss on the Armstrong Estate?—About 15 per cent., although the untenanted land was on the estate.

59600. CHAIRMAN.—Are you satisfied with the Armstrong Estate?—Yes.

59601. Do you call that an ideal arrangement?—Approaching it.

59602. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It is a case where in the removal of congestion land could be found for enlarging holdings on the estate itself?—Yes.

59603. Therefore, it is not a parallel case to that in which people would have to be transferred to a distance?—No. That is why substantial improvement can be effected cheaply.

59604. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—You had not to build new houses?—Very few new houses.

59605. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any estate you have dealt with at all since the beginning where you have had sufficient grass land to enable you to migrate all the people who wanted to migrate and where the arrangements you were able to make have been, in your opinion, as perfect as could possibly be made there; is there any estate that you can give us that will show the loss that would be any guide to us as regards future operations, where you would have power to obtain grass land?—The Armstrong Estate is a fair illustration of the results under favourable circumstances. Although the untenanted land was some distance from the tenanted portion it was within the ambit of the estate, and it cost very much less to rearrange and dispose of, inasmuch as the greater part was given as enlargement.

59606. Suppose that the grass land was not on the estate, and you had to buy from somebody else, say, compulsorily, to what extent do you think that would have increased your loss?—We should have had to migrate at least fifty people out of it, and it would have increased the loss. It would have greatly increased, perhaps doubled, the actual loss.

59607. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It would have been over 30 per cent.?—Probably.

59608. Whereas it was within 15 per cent.?—Yes.

59609. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—Do you count loans in that?—No, we don't count loans, but we count advances on the sale prices of the holdings. Any sum included in the sale price of the holdings in respect of buildings is taken into account before assessing the net loss.

59610. These are just grants, not loans?—Yes; grants or advances to be repaid.

59611. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—Look at the details. Would you have paid any more for the land if you had to buy the land, say, twenty miles off? Would you have paid any higher number of years' purchase for the land than you did in the case of the Armstrong Estate?—We would not.

59612. The land would have been the same?—About the same, or perhaps a little less.

59613. And the other expenditure would have been on building the houses?—Yes, fencing and road making.

59614. In the new place?—Yes.

59615. Preparing the holdings?—Yes.

59616. You say you would have migrated fifty families; how much would it be per family?—I don't believe we would have got the fifty to go.

59617. Assuming you would?—Assuming we would, our net loss would be at least £100 per family. That would be £5,000.

59618. Mr. KAVANAGH.—To build houses and all?—Yes, the net loss.

59619. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—A certain portion of the expenditure would be put on the annuity, but the portion that you would not put on the annuity causes the £5,000 extra?—Yes.

59620. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—Would you have got anything for the goodwill of the places they had abandoned?—We would; but that would be credited to the migrant in the price of his new holding. That is our plan.

59621. But if you gave him the goodwill of his new holding you would not also credit him with the price of the holding which he had abandoned?—No. Our procedure as this—it is explained really in this memorandum later on, but I will give it to you now. We buy, say, £10 worth of land at twenty-seven years' purchase for £270. That is the average price which the land cost us. A man who has a £5 holding proposes to take a £10 holding from us. We value the occupation interest of his holding. The rent, we will say, is £5. If he was an improving tenant he might have reclaimed portion of it; he might have built a house and offices on it; and, we will say, for the sake of illustration, that the gross value of the land in its present condition is estimated by us at £7, although the rent is only £5. In its present condition the rent is estimated at £7. We give him £7 worth of the new holding for £5, and we give him that £7 worth at the price at which we were prepared to sell him the £5 holding if he had not migrated; that is to say, if we had bought that £5 holding from the landlord at twenty years' purchase we would figure out the price of the new holding like this. We would say, "If you don't migrate we will sell you your present holding at the price we paid the landlord, twenty times £5, that is £100; we are going to move you on to a new holding, and will give you £7 worth of land on the new holding for £100." We give him £7 worth of the new holding at the price paid for his £5 holding, because £7 of the new is only the equivalent of the gross annual value of the old holding, and we charge him twenty-seven years' purchase for the remainder of the land included in new holding; that is, if we give him £10 worth altogether we charge him twenty-seven times £3 for the remainder. We would give him the new holding at £181 for the land, *plus* such addition as we consider we ought to make for the new buildings we erect. We cannot erect buildings affording the minimum desirable accommodation for a family under £120. The annual value of the land comprised in our new holdings is generally not less than £15.

59622. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—That is a moderate figure?—Yes. That is for the minimum accommodation. We say to the migrant, "We don't suppose you will be satisfied with the offices we put up. Double them or treble them within the next year if you like." If the value of the land in the holding was only £10 a year, the most we would put on the buildings would be one-eight of the value of the land; that would be an annuity of £1 5*s* on the buildings in addition to the annuity on the land.

59623. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—Then you would have given him the difference between the capital value of the buildings and of the £1 5*s*?—Yes. An annuity of £1 5*s* would, in round figures, represent a capital sum, £40, and the cost of the buildings would be, say, £120, we would lose on the transaction £80, the difference between £120 and £40. We would not lose on the allowance that we make for the occupation interest of the surrendered holding, because we would charge for his vacated land the sum allowed for occupation interest in addition to the cost of the fee-sample.

59624. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—You would get it from the people who got his land?—Yes.

59625. CHAIRMAN.—All this is an annuity arrangement. No cash passes?—Yes. No cash passes.

59626. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—His occupation interest is not merely in the land but in the house?—Yes, if it is a substantial one, but if it is not we don't allow much if anything, for it.

59627. The incomer is to be charged the occupation interest you credit him with?—Yes.

59628. If you pull down the house?—If we do we lose the amount allowed for the building.

59629. If you don't pull down the house how are you relieving congestion?—If we get a migrant to go who has a fairly good house we will always have somewhere near a more or less helpless person with a bad house, and we move that person into the migrant's house and knock down the bad house.

59630. You move, say, a widow from another house into the house of another person, whose interest has been bought?—Yes, and thus get them into better houses. If we fix the rent of the house at 10 shillings a year in estimating the occupation interest, we charge the woman or other person who gets the migrant's buildings 10 shillings a year for the building in the rent.

59631. And you pull down her house?—Yes, if it is a bad one.

59632. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—Do you mean houses to which no land is attached?—No, but in valuing the holdings we first of all put our acreable rents on the

Jan 22, 1908.

Mr Henry Doran,

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

land; we then examine the buildings, and if they are in good repair we put on a separate rent for the buildings in connection with the holding. The average loss on A, B, and C together was 12·9 per cent. As already stated, the tenanted estates A and B comprise 91·7 per cent. of the gross cost price, and the untenanted land, Class C, was only 8·3 per cent. of the gross. If, as recommended in my evidence, the estates dealt with each year by the Board should comprise two-thirds tenanted and one-third untenanted land, the loss if calculated for one-third untenanted in the same proportion as it has actually been on the estates, as shown on list C now handed in, would make the loss on the entire group of estates, comprising two-thirds tenanted and one-third untenanted work out at 17·2 per cent. To make that clear I told you that the gross value of the entire group, A, B, and C was £319,000, but only 8 per cent. of that was untenanted land, and as Sir Antony MacDonnell suggests, the consequence was that we were obliged at the time to sell the group with many uneconomic holdings, not having a sufficient area of suitable untenanted land. If we raise the proportion of C land to 33 per cent., or one-third, leaving A and B at two-thirds, the average loss on the group would work out at 17·2 per cent.

59633. CHAIRMAN.—It is like this: the more grass land you buy and the more bad estates the greater the expense?—Yes.

59634. If you want to deal with the very poorest land where the congestion is greatest you must have a large amount of grass land on hands to relieve it?—You must, if relief is only to be by enlargement of holdings.

59635. And the more grass land you have the greater will be the loss?—Yes.

59636. Sir. FRANCIS MOWATT.—On the other hand, the less congestion the estate has that you purchase the smaller the amount of grass land required?—Yes, and the less loss incurred in treatment.

59637. If you got an estate on the verge of being economic very little grass land would be required?—Yes, and very little loss would be incurred.

59638. And by enlarging the district, as we propose to enlarge it now, until it covers the whole of Connaught and other counties, the area with which you will have to deal will contain a great many more of such estates that are almost economic?—Certainly.

59639. Therefore to that extent the proportion of loss will be reduced?—Very substantially, if you allow me to include all.

59640. Mr. KAVANAGH.—All the grass must be on Class C, but you relieve Class A and B, and in that way is it not unfair to put all the loss on Class C?—No. I said that A contains a small proportion of untenanted land.

59641. But naturally the greater loss occurs on Class C?—Yes. That is the actual loss, which, as a matter of account, might all be debited to the estates benefited.

59642. You relieve Class B and A by it?—Yes; and taking A, B, C together, you get the losses of each class merged.

59643. If there was no Class A and B there would be no necessity for Class C?—No, that is to say, if you did not remove people from Classes A and B you would leave C grazing land as it is at present.

59644. It is not a loss in itself, but it is a loss because it relieves A and B?—Altogether. I consider that these figures, based on actual facts, afford the best guide to what the minimum loss might be in dealing in a similar manner with estates needing treatment in the counties containing congested districts. There is not one of these estates that did not need treatment. No estate was bought by the Board that did not.

59645. CHAIRMAN.—Then that means that you think that 17 per cent. is about the correct figure to allow?—I think it is very near it—ascertained, as it is, from the results of treatment of estates purchased and prepared for sale since the passing of the Act of 1903.

59646. You make a reduction for the sort of estates that Sir Francis has just alluded to?—Yes. This would not include any estate except those needing treatment.

59647. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—There might be a very slight change in it?—If I was allowed to include estates which only need very slight treatment it would reduce the percentage substantially. I have shown in these returns the actual amount expended on improvements on each estate.*

59648. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—I think you do afterwards reduce the percentage from 17 to 15?—Of course this is only a means of roughly estimating it, nothing more than that.

59649. CHAIRMAN.—Those figures go on the assumption that you are dealing with a very poor class of estate. Suppose you had in future to operate over the whole of the area that we have mentioned, what reduction do you think could be made from the 17 per cent?—I estimate that one-fourth of the estates could be passed through without any necessity for treatment, and if that one-fourth be included in the output, and sold through the Board, only a small loss would be incurred, and it would reduce the percentage of loss on entire sales by 4 to 5 per cent.

59650. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—Excluding them altogether?—Excluding them I don't think the figure could be reduced to much less than the figure I state, 15 to 17 per cent.

59651. CHAIRMAN.—Surely we need not go into the question of the estates that do not require treatment at all. They can be passed through without loss. Then there are the very poor estates, such as you have had in your mind here, and also the estates which require some treatment, but not very expensive treatment, because either the grass land lies very adjacent or because the great majority of the tenants are economic tenants. Putting those two classes together, what deduction do you think ought to be made from the 17 per cent?—I think that the estates on lists A, B, C, when grouped, indicate a typical average.

59652. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—I fear you did not state to us that one-fourth of the land might pass without treatment on estates that had no parts of them congested?—No; what I meant was in the whole of the counties containing congestion.

CHAIRMAN.—They don't come into it at all. We need not consider them.

59653. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—I am afraid that Mr. Doran's one-fourth includes two classes, those that contain no portion congested and those that contain small portions congested?—Yes; all the estates, and portions of estates, that might be excluded from purchase by the Board.

59654. Comprising the whole of estates that do not need treatment, and estates, portions of which are capable of being classified as estates, which portions do not need treatment; is that so?—Yes.

59655. CHAIRMAN.—If you go into Connaught tomorrow and buy a block of a million's worth of land, tenanted and untenanted, and proceed to treat it, what do you imagine would be the sort of average loss that you would incur?—I think really that the figures I have given on lists A, B, C afford the most reliable data available for making such an estimate.

59656. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—Your figures profess to deal with land such as you have been dealing with. Now, we want to consider an entirely different state of things. You are coming into districts in which the congestion is not nearly so great. Many of them are almost economic holdings, but upon a lot of those estates there will be a few of these not quite economic which will therefore require some slight treatment. It is obvious that the percentage of expenditure or loss in treating that very small portion of the estate cannot be anything like the amount you will lose in dealing with a very poor estate. You said that under those circumstances, which are not included in those figures, the reduction would be very great on the 17 per cent. I want to ask you have you formed any estimate of what the figure should stand at instead of 17 per cent. loss?—The 17 per cent. is based on the assumption that we are only applying treatment to the portions needing it and excluding the remainder. Consequently if you include the entire of an estate or area one-fourth of which needs no treatment, that will reduce the percentage of loss very substantially.

59657. What do you mean by very substantially?—I told you I based the 17 per cent. loss on the assumption that one-fourth of the lands in those counties would be excluded, and if you include the entire——

59658. You are estimating that in this new district to which you are alluding one-fourth of the land would not require treatment?—Yes.

* See p. 46.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

59659. Therefore you would reduce the 17 per cent. loss practically by one-fourth?—Yes—to from 12 to 13 per cent. of the entire, one-fourth of which involved no loss.

59662. Sir John Colomb.—What you mean is, that suppose you bought the whole county one-fourth of the land in the county would not require treatment?—Yes

59663 Three-fourths would require treatment?—Yes.

59664. You estimate that the average loss upon the three-fourths, that is the estates requiring treatment of some sort or another, would, in the aggregate, amount to 17·2 per cent ?—Yes, but if you were to have the same expenditure, and were to be allowed to include all the estates before calculating an average that 17 per cent. would be reduced approximately by one-fourth

59665. Chairman.—The point is this: excluding, first of all, the one-fourth that don't require treatment at all, that leaves you 75 per cent. of estates that require treatment of some sort?—Yes

59666. The great majority of estates may be estates of the class you have already dealt with which are set out here. With regard to these estates, you tell us you think that 17 per cent is about the proper amount of loss, but my point is, that within that 75 per cent of estates there is another class of estate that you have not dealt with at all hitherto under your Board, the estate which needs a certain amount of improvement, but not any very great improvement. It is not classified in any of your A, B or C. It is not a very poor estate; it is not an estate which has only a small amount of grass land, nor is it an estate which is really mainly grass land It is an estate, 80 or 85 per cent of which perhaps is economic, but a small proportion, 20 or 15 per cent, is uneconomic You have not dealt with that class of estate at all, because it has not been the policy of the Board to devote its attention to that class of estate?—No

59667 You have looked to poorer estates than these and these were crowded out If we give you the whole of Connaught you will find within the 75 per cent. which you have got to treat some estates of that kind?—I don't think so I think they are in the one-fourth that are excluded

59668 Most Rev. Dr O'Donnell.—In the 75 per cent Mr Doran, I think, includes only land—I won't say estates—requiring remedial treatment. In the 25 per cent. he not only includes estates that have no portion of them congested, but also includes that portion of estates having a little bit of congestion, which is not congested Am I right in saying that in the one-fourth you include, first, estates that have no portion congested, and second, estates that have a little bit congested, and that you include the non-congested part of those estates?—In my replies I have only one procedure before my mind all through. It is this, that the Board would continue to do what they have done in the past, and only buy estates needing treatment

59669. Do we take it your 17 per cent of loss is for estates of every class requiring remedial treatment?—Yes.

59670 Therefore in the 75 per cent of estates requiring remedial treatment you have no portions of estates or large portions of estates that don't require remedial treatment?—No.

59671. Now, you think that the only question you require to address yourself to is this. Suppose we take as one-fourth the portions of estates that are not congested and take them over to the other side, what reduction then could you make on your 17 per cent Within the 75 per cent you have nothing but land requiring extensive remedial treatment. Suppose you take over to the same side of the line the purchase of estates that don't require remedial treatment, what are your deductions on the 17 per cent?—I am not satisfied that the problem is before you in the way in which it appears to me at all I must ask you to let me try to explain it again

59672. Mr Bryce.—Take the case of the Dillon Estate, you did that without loss?—Yes

59673 If you had bought it since the passing of the 1903 Act or just before it, when prices were rising a bit, you would have lost about 11 or 12 per cent. Suppose the Dillon estate had not been sold and you had got to buy it now and treat it, what would be your loss on that particular estate?—I daresay we would lose 10 per cent. now.

59673a. Going into the market to buy the Dillon estate at the rate of prices now existing and under the circumstances now existing, what would you calculate you would probably lose in the treatment of it to-day?—I think about 10 per cent.

59674 No more than that?—No, if we only dealt with the estate as we have done.

59675. Most Rev. Dr O'Donnell.—That is under the 17 per cent. Surely the Dillon estate is as bad an estate as you could treat?—We have not put it into a satisfactory condition. More than half the holdings on the Dillon estate are uneconomic holdings We could not get the land for them. We made the best job we could within the boundaries.

59676 If you were treating it in the way you would treat it now if you had sufficient untenanted land, what would it cost you more than 10 per cent.?—It would cost at least 20 per cent to put it into what I could call a satisfactory state.

59677. Lord Dudley's question is this. The Dillon estate was as bad as you could have: are you not likely to have in your 75 per cent. certain estates not requiring much treatment, the average loss then being very much less than 17 per cent.?—Yes. I have some on the list of A estates I am submitting to you. For instance, I will give you a case to the point that appears here. The Colles-Sandes estate cost £71,000, and the loss on it was only 2 8 per cent.

59678. Chairman.—Are not you likely to have estates of that sort?—Yes; and there is a proportion of them on these lists. I think it is a fair proportion. That is what I have meant by saying this group of estates, A, B. C lists, is typical of the volume of the class of estates the Board would deal with within an average year

59679 And you have taken them into consideration in your 17 per cent.?—Yes. There is £71,000 for the estate mentioned, and there is a loss of 2 8 per cent. That is included in Class A, and helps to keep the average loss low.

59680. Won't you have more of that sort of estate now that your area is going to be enlarged into non-scheduled districts than you had before, when you had only the scheduled districts to deal with?—I am estimating that you would not have a larger proportion than in this list if you do not buy estates or sections of estates that do not need treatment.

59681. Sir Francis Mowatt.—That list is what has been done already?—Yes, under Act of 1903 I commenced by saying I thought this group of estates fairly typical.

59682. Chairman.—Your list must be based on the area you have hitherto to deal with, which, being a scheduled area, is a very poor area. You have got a certain proportion of estates on that area which have cost you very little My point is, now that your area is going to be enlarged by the addition of richer territory is not it probable you will find a greater number of estates of that class in that territory You have just mentioned one estate on which you only lost 2 or 3 per cent.?—Yes.

59683. Therefore won't the average loss be materially reduced?—Yes, if you include all estates in the enlarged area

59684 These are not estates which you would not deal with Those would be estates you would treat. They would not be the 25 per cent. that you would pass off and not deal with at all They would be in the 75 per cent of estates with which you would have to deal?—If there was a larger proportion of estates, or portions of estates, not needing expensive treatment than in this list, that would reduce the percentage of loss on the entire.

59685. Chairman.—That is the whole point of the question—how much will it reduce it?——

Sir John Colomb.—Against that would not there be, with enlarged powers, other estates which now, with the area of land available restricted, are not included, and which would cost you very much more than these estates to settle I agree with Lord Dudley, that such estates as the Colles-Sandes Estate would materially reduce the percentage; but, suppose you have to deal with an estate like Lord Dillon's, under modern conditions, and with enlarged powers, where you would not leave the estate as it is, you would have that estate on the other side of the account, which would cause increased expense, and counterbalance the savings on such estates as the Colles-Sandes Estate. One would be a set off against the other?—Yes, to some extent.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

59686. I am arguing against the reduction of the 17 per cent.?—What I am anxious to do is to show you clearly how the figures based on actual experience of 1903 Act cases work out in percentage of loss.

59687. CHAIRMAN.—What we want to arrive at is this suppose we recommend that you should have a certain amount with which to buy land every year—for the sake of argument, suppose we say a million—what is the correct amount of money that should be given to you to lose on that million?—I think it would be well if you allowed me to read my memorandum, because I deal with those points.

59688. You must have some basis for your figures. 17 per cent on a million a year would be £170,000?—You have not overlooked the fact that this 17 per cent is not based on C estates alone, but also on A and B, that is, on two-thirds tenanted lands and one-third untenanted.

59689 It is only another way of saying you want an adequate amount of grass land to deal with the other land?—Yes, but it affects the price and the extent of the loss, the untenanted land being the most expensive to purchase and to treat in preparation for migrants.

59690 But taking your view, that one-third untenanted is the proper amount to have in hands, and if 17 per cent is the amount of loss on the million, £170,000 a year would have to be given to the Board to treat a million?—Yes.

59691 We have got to show some reason for whatever figure we recommend There is not the smallest use in saying that £170,000 is the amount, unless we can make it up in some way. We have got to give some reasons for that?—Yes. I am giving you the best proof in the results of actual transactions completed

59692. SIR JOHN COLOMB.—You work out all these things later on?—Yes The loss on the Board's dealing with this one-third of a million probably is only 12 per cent, but the Board's treatment of these estates is unsafe, because they had not sufficient untenanted land, and I suggest, therefore, that the untenanted land should be increased from 8 per cent, which it is actually in the group of estates submitted, to 33 per cent, which it ought to be if the tenanted holdings are made economic, and the loss by that change alone is raised from 12 to 17 per cent. I may observe that the tenants of these groups all paid at least two years' full rent, and that the untenanted land was sold at the average price which all the untenanted land purchased by the Board cost, namely, twenty-seven years' purchase of the estimated fair annual value, consequently, in making an estimate of the average loss in future transactions on the basis indicated by these figures—*i.e.*, 17 2 per cent., it is very important to bear in mind that if the untenanted lands are not purchased at the prices at which they can be sold at, on an average, a further loss will be entailed in excess of the 17·2 per cent. The bulk of the holdings on the estates in Class A have not been enlarged to any appreciable extent, and on sale were largely composed of uneconomic holdings The chief improvements effected through the loss of 9·4 per cent. being the re-arrangement of scattered or rundale holdings, improvement of dwellings, construction of drains, fences, and roads. Although these estates have been appreciably benefited by the Board's treatment the results cannot be considered altogether satisfactory while a large proportion of the holdings disposed of cannot be classed as economic

59693 Mr. BRYCE.—In what class do you class the Dillon Estate?—In Class A Class B comprised poorer estates than those in Class A A larger number of the holdings needed re-arrangement, and where, as a rule, owing to the poor character of the land, the works carried out in connection with re-arrangement, drainage and road-making were not considered to be sufficiently directly reproductive to charge any appreciable portion of the outlay to the sale prices of the holdings, a large percentage of loss has consequently occurred, with results that are even less satisfactory than in the case of holdings comprised in Class A.

59694 Mr KAVANAGH.—Could you give me the names of any estates in Class B?—The Carna Estate would be included in Class B, and the estates about Mallaranny, the Connemara and Erris Estates I have here a list of the estates and the expenditure They include the Bandon Estate, in the County Cork; the Gethings Estate, near Lissadell; Hazell Estate, near Carna; the Foley Estate, and other estates. The estates included in Classes A and B may be taken as fair types of poor estates in congested districts, but it will be observed that the proportion of Class B, which comprises very poor estates, is small compared with Class A That is 15 per cent. against 75. The estates in Class C are wholly or mainly untenanted estates used for migration, and form only 8·3 per cent of the gross. In considering the suggestion to fix a percentage of loss which the Board may incur in dealing with the year's output of estates, it is of importance to study the proportions which the values of Classes A, B, and C respectively bear to the gross value of the three classes grouped together, for it is manifest that if the Board are limited to an average percentage of loss in the year's output, they must arrange to group for treatment the Classes A, B, and C in such proportions as will bring out the average percentage of loss allowed. To illustrate this, if they confined themselves during the year in dealing with estates in Class A, these would involve an average loss of 9 4 per cent.

59695 Mr. BRYCE.—You say that the Dillon Estate was in Class A?—Yes, but these lists only include estates purchased under Act of 1903

59696 You say that in dealing with the Dillon Estate now there would be a loss of 20 per cent.?—Yes, if we were to put it into a satisfactory condition by extensive migration. The Dillon Estate, treated as it has been, would not cost more, but providing land elsewhere to remove a sufficient number of tenants to make the holdings of those who remain economic would involve a loss of 20 per cent

59697. CHAIRMAN.—The Dillon Estate itself might cost more?—What I mean is apart from the probable difference in the price of it owing to altered conditions

59698 You might not be able to hold it as you did, you might not be able to get the same revenue out of it as you did then?—I meant in the cost of works and anything that we have done on the Dillon Estate

59699 But then you were helped by a number of favourable circumstances?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—If those favourable circumstances did not exist then as they might not exist now you would not have been able to deal with the Dillon Estate without migration for a loss of 9·4 per cent

59700. Mr. BRYCE.—On the Dillon Estate actually you lost nothing I don't think Mr Doran made it quite clear whether he was dealing with future conditions in that 9 per cent. and whether he included the loss that is going to be caused by a complete system of migration?—No; I am merely giving you what actually happened on the estates named in the lists submitted, but I tell you that these are, as they are grouped, fair types of estates that will be purchased by Board in future operations.

Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—It would be very difficult to say what loss would be incurred on such properties, enormous properties, as the Dillon Estate, in two or three different contingencies first, the migration of all the people you desire to migrate, and in the next place in the conditions of sale being altogether changed. I don't think Mr Doran could do that without great consideration

Mr. BRYCE.—Is it not essential that we should know that? How can we ask for a definite sum unless we know what it is going to cost to migrate the people?

Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—The Dillon Estate was bought cheap and before the Act of 1903 He has given us examples of purchase under the Act of 1903 which therefore are a much better guide to us with reference to future purchases

59704 Mr BRYCE.—Have you given us any complete case of an estate, in any one or other of these classes, in which you migrated on a sufficiently large scale all the people you wanted to migrate so that you will know what with increased powers it will cost you when you are going to migrate all the people whom you require to migrate?—No, but I can give an estate where there was migration alone carried out and I will tell you what it cost—untenanted land alone to which a certain number of persons were migrated. The case you ask for is an ideal one, where you provide all the tenants on the estate with economic holdings. I don't believe we will be able to approach that perfect ideal in practice.

59705. That is Utopia it would not be possible to provide for it, but you must have in your mind for our purpose some kind of an estate, what you are likely to be able to do, and what it is likely to cost?—I think this memorandum gives you that, if I may read it. It gives the proportion of tenanted land,

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

A and B in this list Then I state what it actually cost to treat these estates At the same time I tell you that we had not enough of untenanted land, and that instead of having only 8·3 per cent we should have 33 per cent., and if we had 33 per cent. we should be able to have more migrants, and enlarge more uneconomic holdings, and then the estimated loss of 14 per cent. is based on the assumption that we would be able to get the 33 per cent. of untenanted land under the new conditions, and if so we could bring these classes, A and B as near the ideal suggested of an average £10 rateable value the loss would be about 18 per cent. The percentages of loss on individual estates in Class A, 7 7 25 4, 15, 24, 11 9, 6·3, 12·9, 20·3, 10·6, 3·6, 8, 18 7 2·8. These are the varying rates of which the average comes out at 9·4 per cent I have pointed out that if the Board confined themselves during the year to dealing with estates in Class A these would involve an average loss of 9 4 per cent. If, on the other hand, they deal only with the poorest estates, Class B, the loss will be 21 6 per cent, and if they confine themselves solely to migration, the loss would be at least 30 per cent.; so that in fixing the average net loss to be incurred on estates dealt with in the year, it would always be necessary to so arrange the proportions of the different classes sold each year as would bring out the average loss at the percentage allowed. I have endeavoured to do this as far as possible with the limited opportunities for grouping the estates that the small extent of purchases by the Board have hitherto afforded. An examination of the past records of the Board's work, as well as a reference to the estates now classed under B, make it clear that the poor and less resourceful estates cannot be dealt with, with a less loss than 20 per cent of the cost price On a few of these estates the loss even exceeded 100 per cent of the cost price. It may be taken for certain that extensive migration of small landholders cannot be safely carried out at a less loss than 30 per cent of the cost price of the land, and this on the assumption that the land can be sold to the migrants at the price paid for it.

59709. That is of the untenanted land. You buy an estate to migrate these people from, and you buy an untenanted estate to migrate them to?—That is Class C.

59710. You are looking at that quite independently?—For this purpose I have taken it that every holding you carve out involves a certain loss. I afterwards merge that into the general group. The average price paid by the Board for all untenanted land acquired was, as given in my evidence, 27 years' purchase of an estimated fair rent, the annuity on which would be equivalent to 12½ per cent reduction in the rent. In my opinion the annuity of a migrant's holding ought not at the outside exceed 85 per cent of the estimated fair letting value of the holding including buildings, and even this rate seems to leave rather too small a margin of security for the payment of the annuity for such a long period as 68½ years, and I would much prefer if it was possible to finance it, that the annuity on the holding should not exceed 85 per cent. of the fair rent of the land excluding the buildings. It would be quite possible to do this if migrants could be found who would surrender fairly substantial holdings, for the occupation interest in the holdings they surrender would in all cases be deducted from the cost price of the land in the new holding, but in the case of small holdings this occupation interest is not sufficient to cover the sum added to the value of the land in respect of the necessary buildings erected upon it. So that if the Board continue to acquire untenanted land at 27 years' purchase of an estimated fair rent, and that the migrants to these lands are persons who surrender very small holdings, it will not be possible to let them have the new holdings at an annuity representing 85 per cent of the fair rent of the land alone without incurring a larger loss than 30 per cent. I should also point out that it appears probable that the Board will seek to acquire a much larger proportion of non-residential tenanted holdings than they have hitherto acquired, and if they are obliged to pay more for such holdings than for land in the owner's possession they will be unable to sell the new holdings created out of such land at annuities which do not exceed 85 per cent of the fair rent, without incurring a much larger loss than 30 per cent. on the cost price of the land alone of the migrant's holdings. Personally I see no reason why a larger price should be paid for land jointly owned by two persons (tenant and landlord) than if it were occupied by only one of these persons. The price charged the migrant should not be affected by the number of persons who previously had ownership or claims on the land he gets.

59711. CHAIRMAN.—Would you reverse that. Do you see any reason why a larger price should be paid for land held or owned by one person than for land held or owned by two?—No. I think the same price should be paid in both cases

59712. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—You are speaking irrespective of buildings and equipments?—The land includes those. They should be taken into account in valuing it, a separate valuation being placed upon the buildings.

59713 Mr. KAVANAGH.—The occupation interest?—It is there in both cases

59714 It might be divided among two persons or it might be altogether in one?—Yes, and if a man is owner in fee-simple and also the occupier that is no reason why he should not get the value of his occupation interest.

59715. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—Would you say you would pay the same if the land is occupied by the owner? You would suppose in that case that the holdings would have the buildings and equipments which it would have in case it were in the possession of a different occupier?—It does not affect it. I propose to buy a tract of land, and if I buy I get everything that is on it, buildings and all. Before I arrive at a decision as to what it is worth I must value it. I value the land as I see it on an estimate of the revenue the land is capable of yielding when managed in a husbandlike manner, and I also value the buildings It does not matter who the owners are, or how many there are, the productiveness of the land and its value, including building and other improvements, remain the same.

59716. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—Or how many there are?—Or how many there are. You have put a full value on what you are going to buy irrespective of how many owners, and the price which you are putting upon it of course will have to be fixed, having regard to what you can sell it at, and what it is really worth Then it is a question when you come to apportion the price afterwards. You give to the landlord his share, whatever it is, and to the occupier the other share. If the landlord is the occupier you give him both shares

59717 CHAIRMAN.—But there is a difference in the case in which the land is in the hands of the two people, landlord and tenant. The price which the land represents to the landlord is so many years' purchase of the rent. That is what it is worth to him?—Yes; that is what it is worth to him where there is a permanent tenant on it. He has only the revenue to sell He cannot give possession of the land.

59718. He has got so many years' purchase of the revenue? The revenue has been fixed by the State and what he has got to sell is that revenue so fixed?—Yes

59719 In the case of untenanted land he has got to sell so many years' purchase of rent not fixed by the State, but which he could obtain for himself by open competition?—He has the land to sell, and can give possession of it, and the value of it is to be measured by its productiveness, its gross yield, when managed in a husbandlike manner, after deducting all necessary outgoings incidental to its management.

59720 Its gross yield can only be measured either by what he makes out of it by farming it himself or what somebody will give him for it?—Yes.

59721. If it is measured by what somebody will give him for it in the open market, unfettered by any action of the State it is measured by what you can get for it?—If land were bought in the open market, without any financial aid from the State to purchase the fee-simple of it, it would not bring an excessive price.

59722 There is not State interference with the owner of untenanted land He can put it up in the market for open competition, which will bid up the price of the land to a certain figure, and then he can sell that for so many years' purchase—is not that so?—In that case the price the owner gets is enhanced, and usually excessive, by reason of the State financing the buyer to purchase the fee-simple.

59724. In one case the market is open and free; in the other case it is limited by the action of the State

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

—I am not arguing whether action is right or wrong. Therefore there is a difference where the land is in the hands of one man—the landlord?—The intrinsic value of the land is not affected by the number of the owners.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—It appears to me in two ways. In one case it is income from the land guaranteed him by the State.

Chairman.—It is fixed, but not guaranteed.

59726. Mr. Sutherland.—Is the competition for untenanted land open and free?—Yes; it is quite free, except within the small area of disturbed districts.

Mr. Sutherland.—Can you make land?

Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Is the income on a permanent basis?

59727. Mr. Sutherland.—Is not it the price of a monopoly he gets?—I don't know that you can put it in that way unless you assume land should be the property of the nation.

59728. Chairman.—Land is limited and is required, and to that extent, of course, is affected by what you may call a monopoly, but that must apply to land everywhere. But putting aside that and putting aside any question of agitation, cattle driving and anything of that sort, is it not true that land in the hands of a landlord in Ireland, untenanted land, is subject to a perfectly free and competitive rent?—Yes.

59729. You can put that land up in the open market. There is nothing to prevent a man from Scotland coming and taking it?—No.

59730. And the man from Scotland may bid against a man from the locality, and force the price up until one considers that it is not worth it, and drops out?—Yes.

59731. That right and the income thus received is what the landlord has to sell when he is selling his land?—Yes, but a prudent purchaser will have regard to the instability of a competitive rental.

59732. In the other case, where there are two partners in the land, the State has, by Parliamentary action, limited the extent to which the rent can be bid up?—Yes.

59733. Therefore the landlord in that case is selling a property which is subject to that State limit?—Yes.

59734. Therefore he is not in the same position as the man who has got no tenant?—He has not the same ownership in the land.

59735. Therefore there is a difference in the price to be paid to a landlord when the land is in the sole possession of the landlord, another man, the tenant, has an interest in it?—I can see no difference in value, but in one case the value is owned by one person. In the other case the same value is owned by two persons.

59736. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Would you consider that the competitive income from grass land is so secure as the State fixed income from judicial rents?—No. I was going to explain that you cannot put the capitalising of the two incomes on the same basis. One is not so secure as the other.

59737. There is no margin of security in the one case?—Not for the same price.

59738. Sir John Colomb.—Why not?—One is up to its competition value. The revenue varies according to competition from year to year. The other revenue is what a Land Commissioner, Mr. Justice O'Hagan, defined as a live and thrive rent, an easy annual assessment made on the products of the land which the tenant is supposed to pay year in and year out easily and to live and thrive. A man getting possession of a tract of land subject to the payment of that easy rent every year has a saleable interest in the land subject to that rent because it affords him or persons equally desirous of pursuing farming as an industry the opportunity of making a living out of it. Such persons could not make their living from the profits of the land after paying a competitive or accommodation rent.

59739. Mr. Bryce.—You are now talking of the tenant's interest?—Yes, incidentally.

59740. We are talking of it from the point of view of the landlord?—The Board want to get a tract of land which is very necessary for the poor tenants adjoining. The value of that land is not regulated or should not be affected by the number of persons who claim ownership in it.

59741. Look at it from the landlord's point of view. We have evidence that the letting value of the untenanted lands has practically not changed for fifteen years. On the other hand, the experience has been that every fifteen years the other rent does go down. Therefore, looking at it from the point of view of history, the undivided interest in the untenanted land is of more value and of more stable value than the other is?—I can give you figures to show that grazing rents in Roscommon and Mayo have fallen considerably during the past twenty years.

59742. Chairman.—We need not go into that at present?—I submit a list showing the prices paid by the Board for a number of tenanted holdings which they acquired,* classified as follows:—First Term Tenants—Acquired by voluntary agreement without initiation of any legal proceedings. First Term Tenants—Acquired by pre-emption proceedings. First Term Tenants—Acquired by resumption proceedings. Second Term Tenants—Acquired by voluntary agreement without initiation of any legal proceedings. Second Term Tenants—Acquired by pre-emption proceedings. Second Term Tenants—Acquired by resumption proceedings. Future Tenancies—Acquired by Notices to Quit. In some of these cases the Board acquired the land by voluntary agreement without initiating any legal proceedings. In other cases on receipt of notice from tenants of their intention to sell at a price named, the Board serve notice to pre-empt, and in several cases were advised to pay the excessive prices offered, when after making inquiries they were satisfied that the intending purchaser was a *bona fide* one and desired to carry out the bargain. The Board served notices to resume possession of several holdings, and the prices paid were, in most cases, settled by agreement before the hearing of the case by the Land Commission. In a few cases the prices were fixed by the Land Commission after hearing all parties. In many cases notices to quit were served to determine future tenancies and the prices paid were in accordance with the scale laid down by the Act.

59743. I don't know whether you could very shortly run over the different procedure. If the Board has acquired an estate and hears that a tenant wishes to sell, and serves a notice of pre-emption, how is the price fixed then?—A tenant holding under a judicial tenancy cannot complete the sale of his tenant-right in his holding without first serving the landlord with notice of his intention to sell, setting out in his notice the terms on which he has arranged to sell his holding.

59744. Is not it sold by auction?—Sometimes, but not often. Sometimes he serves notice of his intention to sell by auction, or sometimes he serves notice that he intends to sell to, say, John Jones for £150.

59745. Where he says he is going to sell by auction?—First of all the landlord comes into communication with him, and makes an offer, and if they cannot agree the landlord serves him with a cross-notice that—"Having failed to come to terms with you for the purchase of your holding, I give you notice that I will apply to the Land Commission to fix the true value." The Land Commission hear both parties, and fix the price at which the landlord pre-empts.

59746. Sir John Colomb.—The landlord is obliged to accept that price no matter whether he considers it fair or not?—Yes.

59747. Chairman.—You say that in several cases where the man served notice that he was going to sell the Board served notice to pre-empt, and were advised to pay the excessive prices offered when after inquiry they were satisfied that the intending purchaser was a *bona fide* one, and intended to carry out the bargain?—Yes. In one case we had to pay up to forty-seven years, which included buildings and improvements not included in the rent. As regards resumption proceedings, under Section 83 of the Act of 1903 the Board have power to resume possession of a holding held under a judicial tenancy for the purpose of striping or migration, or the enlargement of holdings. They did not have that power before the Act of 1903, and the Board have in a great many cases exercised that power within the last fifteen months. In the case of all such holdings in which they have done so they have served the occupier with notice to resume possession; and the occupier then having consulted his lawyer, and finding the Board were empowered to resume, would negotiate with them. We have agreed in all cases, except a few, where we had to go to court, and got the Land Commission to fix the price.

59748. The hearing is carried on in the same way as under pre-emption?—Yes.

59749. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Is it the Land Commission in that case?—In both cases.

* See p. 47.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

59750. CHAIRMAN.—An ordinary landlord has the same power of pre-emption as you have?—Yes.

59751. He has no power of resumption?—He has, but only for purposes specified, for the enlargement of his demesne or taking sites for the extension of a town, as specified in Section 5 of the Act of 1881. Section 83 of the Act of 1903 says that the Congested Districts Board is empowered to resume possession of a holding, during the continuance of a statutory term, for the purpose of migration and the enlargement of holdings, and also for all the purposes named in Section 5 of the Act of 1881.

59752. As regards future tenants there is a notice to quit?—Any landlord may determine a future tenancy by serving notice to quit.

59753. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—Not unless there are arrears?—Yes; whether there are arrears or not, and the Board have precisely the same powers as any landlord, namely, to determine future tenancies by notice to quit; but they are obliged to pay compensation in accordance with the scale laid down in the Act of 1881, which is fixed according to the rent payable and the number of years' purchase he is to get for disturbance, and in addition to that number of years' purchase, he has to be also paid for the unexhausted value of his improvements.

59754. Does that go before the County Court Judge?—Yes. It is settled by him.

59755. With regard to resumption, have the Estates Commissioners the same power of resumption as you have?—I don't think they have.

59756. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—It requires a year's notice for resumption?—No; they may serve notice for resumption any time.

59757. It cannot be operative for a year?—It may take less than a year.

59758. If the Congested Districts Board wish to obtain possession of a future tenancy is it not bound by a year's notice?—Yes. That is done by notice to quit under which they must usually give a year's notice. Although the Board have that power of resuming possession of a judicial holding, there was evidently some mistake in the drafting of the Act, for they have no power to resume possession of a present yearly tenancy, and when we desire to obtain possession of a holding held under a yearly tenancy we must first serve notice on the tenant to have a fair rent fixed, and then, having done that, we have to serve the resumption notice. We have had several cases of that lately.

59759. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—How does that arise? Do they not come under the Act of 1881?—They did not have a fair rent fixed. The Board have power to resume possession of a holding held under a judicial tenancy, while they have no power to resume possession of a holding held under a yearly present tenancy.

59760. How did that yearly present tenancy arise?—The yearly present tenancy is one subsisting at the passing of the Act of 1881, but the occupier has not since then had a rent judicially fixed. He might have had his rent reduced by agreement, not filed, or he might have considered that if he went into court he would not get any reduction, or he might have held as yearly tenant a large grass farm, and was afraid to try to have a judicial rent fixed, lest it might be declared to be a non agricultural holding. At any rate, we now find him as a yearly tenant, and cannot put him out before we have a fair rent fixed.

59761. He never took advantage of the Act of 1881—that is what it means?—Yes. In a few cases the price was fixed by the Land Commission—that is, in resumption cases—but in cases in which notice to quit was served to determine future tenancies, the prices paid were in accordance with the scale laid down. In proof that migration cannot be safely carried out at a less loss than thirty per cent., I submit the following particulars:—Take a £15 holding. The cost price at twenty-seven years is £405.

59762. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—You mean of the estimated fair rent or the actual fair rent?—£15—the estimated fair rent. At 27 years' purchase the price of the holding at that rent is £405. The cost of building is increasing, and I put down the cost at £130. Roads cost £20 and fences £20.

59763. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—Have not you spoken of that £130 as £120 during the day?—I did in the last case; and I gave you particulars of holdings where the cost was £108. But they are costing more where we are getting into the open areas, and where there are few labourers to be got. For instance, at present we have fifty men housed in temporary houses. We had to import them from the congested districts to put up houses on holdings formed on the grass ranches of Roscommon. We had to import those workers, as there were so few labourers living in the neighbourhood of those grass areas. They had to be paid more wages, and the operations are more expensive. The cost of buildings has risen to £130, the cost of roads £20, and of fences £20. The total cost of a £15 holding is thus £575. If the sale price be calculated on an annuity of 85 per cent. of the £15, annual value, that is £12 16s., the total is £394, and there is thus a loss of £181. From this loss of £181 you have to deduct the occupation interest in the holding vacated by the migrant who will come to it.

59764. And the worse off the migrant and the smaller his holding the larger the loss?—Yes. From this I submit the following deductions:—1. If the occupation interest of the surrendered holding were only £35 (which was the average value of the occupation interest of the first 207 migrants dealt with), the loss would be £181 *less* £35, *i.e.*, £146 per holding, equal to 36 per cent. of the cost price of the land alone. This loss, in the case of the 207 migrants referred to, would have been 37·3 per cent. if the buildings had cost £130, and the roads and fences £40, but in these cases the average expenditure per holding on the buildings was £108, fences £20, and the roads and other improvements £16—that is an expenditure per holding of £26 less than the amount given above. The fee-simple of the land in the 207 migrants' holdings, referred to in the Fourteenth Annual Report (page 121), cost £66,452, which would be an average cost of £321 for the land. The migrants dealt with in the succeeding year, as given in the Fifteenth Report (page 132), involved a loss of £87 per holding (page 13). I am comparing the actual cases. The average loss was only about 26 per cent., but I believe they will cost more in future, and that the average loss will not be less than 30 per cent.

59765. That loss will fall not upon the Irish Land Stock, but upon the State?—That is what we want, but up to the present the only portion of the Board's funds which are not derived from Irish sources is the Parliamentary grant of £20,000 a year.

59766. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—So it will not be a loss against the Irish ratepayers?—It will fall on the Exchequer if given as a special grant to meet those losses.

59767. CHAIRMAN.—On the income of the Board?—What I would like to emphasise is that the more migration work the Board do the more radical and effective their treatment is. The country is really getting good value for it, as compared with one-fourth of the loss in dealing with estates, which are not substantially improved.

59768. That is to say, in your opinion, it is better to incur even 30 per cent. loss and do the thing thoroughly than to have a loss of, say, 15 per cent. on an estate like the Dillon Estate, and leave the thing in a half-completed condition?—Yes. You leave the estate improved, but with a large number of the holdings uneconomic. A very large number of the holdings there are uneconomic. Then I go on to my second example. 2. If the occupation interest of the surrendered holding were £50, the loss would be £181, less £50, equal to £131, or 32·3 per cent. loss on the cost price of the land (£405). 3. If the occupation interest of the surrendered holding were £85, the loss would be £181, less £85, equal to £96, or 23·7 per cent. loss on the cost price of the land alone (£405). That shows that if you could get a substantial class of migrants you would be able to carry out the migration schemes with very much less loss. Moreover, the more the loss you incur by reason of having to deal with small landholders as migrants the less satisfactory is the work you are doing, because you are getting the least suitable class of migrants, and each small holding vacated permits but a small enlargement of adjacent small holdings.

59769. Mr. BRYCE.—What do you do with the occupation interest on passing the vacated land to the man whose holding you enlarge?—We charge him the fee-simple value as well as the occupation interest allowed to the migrant.

59770. You charge it to the annuity?—Yes. Suppose there is a man with a £4 holding adjacent, and the price paid for this class of holding on the estate is twenty years' purchase, we charge him that rate for his own holding. We give him £2 worth

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jun. 22, 1908.
Mr. Henry Doran.

of the vacated land, and we charge him twenty-seven years' purchase of the £2 worth.

59771. You recover from the enlarged man the whole of the surrender value of the piece in occupation of the man who goes out?—Yes, usually.

59772. You make no loss under that heading at all?—No. Our estimate of occupation interest is such a sum as can be recovered from the persons who get the vacated land and no more. If we are apparently not allowing the man enough for the holding he surrenders it must be borne in mind that he gets an equivalent value of land in the new holding in exchange for his old holding.

59773. The man who is put into the new holding takes not the £5 but the £7?—Yes. We charge the enlarged man at the same rate as we charge the migrant on the value of the additional land he gets, and in that way we make one balance the other, and give each equal value. We lose when the price paid exceeds twenty-seven years' purchase of an estimated fair rent.

59774. Sir John Colomb.—In this case, Number 3, you lose 23·7 per cent., and the man can then sell the interest in his new holding, and you cannot prevent him?—No; but he is probably replaced by a better man.

59775. But he gets the benefit?—Yes; but the State has no concern with the individuals. Its main concern is in having the new holding occupied by an industrious member of the community, and to have it of sufficient size to maintain such a man and his family according to a fair standard of comfort. If the man the Board placed on the holding fails from any cause, he has to sell his interest, and he is replaced by another man, who puts solid cash into it, and thus increases the security.

59776. The tenant you migrate is in possession of a holding which represents less than the value of the holding?—Yes.

59777. Less by so much, by £181 in this case, and if he sells when he comes in he walks off with the money, because you buy the thing as it stands?—You did not arrange to lose that £181 in order to help the individual you put into the place first. You were justified in losing that £181 in order to have a holding formed which was to be occupied by an industrious family for the benefit of the country, and to relieve congestion by the addition of the migrants' vacated land to adjacent holdings.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—The man Number 1 has done the man Number 2 out of something; but you are not concerned with that.

59778. Sir John Colomb.—The man can sell the holding, but the State loses?—The State never get the money back. If they did all that for farmers, and did not put migrants into them, but put these places and buildings up for auction, they would get wholly different men, men with capital; but the object was to relieve the poor and destitute; but if the object was merely to get industrious tenants on the land, I think the State could very well split up these lands and sell them.

59779. Sir Francis Mowatt.—Surely the man who sells out—the poor tenant to whom you allude, is covered pretty well, because he has got the value of his holding, the money paid for it by the other man. The latter may have bought it for too much, if you like, but at the same time that does not affect the State?—The man to whom you give it is removed from the congested area, and it is nothing to the State, from my point of view, if he sells it in a month.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—You get the same annuity from the second man as the first.

59781. Sir John Colomb.—You would lose £181. If you went into a congested area and said, "I will give you so much to clear out and go where you like," they would do it probably for £50?—A great many of them would emigrate on these terms, but nobody advocates wholesale emigration as a desirable remedy for relief of congestion. What I propose is to transfer the best men you can get into the open areas, losing a certain amount of money, in order to provide economic holdings for them and their successors. I don't believe the migrants will sell unless they fail from ill-health or other cause. None of our migrants have sold. If the migrant's annuity was to be kept at 85 per cent. of the fair rent of the new holding, including buildings, I would say a fair rent for such buildings as we erect on a £15 holding would be £2, making the gross fair rent £17, which, multiplied by 26½, would leave the gross price of the holding £446, and the annuity on this would be £14 10s. Fifteen per cent. off the gross rent of £17 would be £14 9s., and the loss in the cases cited would be reduced to the following:—For case I. the loss would be £94, equal to 23·2 per cent. on the cost price of the land alone (£405); for case II. the loss would be £79, equal to 19·5 per cent. on the cost price of the land alone; for case III. the loss would be £44, equal to 10·9 per cent on the cost price of the land alone. These figures are very important in connection with the lists of A, B, C estates, which I have submitted to you, with the intention of showing that unless the Board go in for acquiring untenanted land, which is the most costly operation in connection with the settlement of estates, to the extent of one-third, they will not be able to alter materially the conditions of any large proportion of the congested districts by the enlargement of holdings, and that if they do incur a very large loss on one-third of the estates dealt with they should be placed in a position to lose about 17 per cent. on the year's output; but, as I have explained, if they buy a larger proportion of property on which they will have a small loss, the percentage of loss can be kept lower, but the estates most in need of improvement must be taken in hand slowly.

59782. Mr. Bryce.—In that table* you give a case where it would have cost 37·3 per cent. Don't you think, bearing in mind that that might occur in a great many cases, and also that you might not be able to get this untenanted land at 27 years' purchase, that the average of 30 per cent. loss on cases in Class C is insufficient?—I have repeated more than once that my percentage of loss throughout is based on the assumption that the Board won't pay for the land more than they can re-sell it at, and you cannot safely sell to migrants at an annuity that would be higher than 85 per cent. of a fair rent after allowing for occupation interest.

59783. Chairman.—Up to the present you have an average of twenty seven years for untenanted land?—For all the untenanted land that was bought.

59784. Speaking roughly, suppose you proceed to purchase that land on a basis of net income, do you think the basis of twenty-seven years would provide the net income from that land?—It would depend on the rate of interest.

59785. Say 3½?—It would come to more than twenty-seven years' purchase on 3½ per cent.

59786. Twenty-seven and a-half years' purchase would not give him his net income?—No. In addition to the 27½ years' purchase, he has got the bonus, so that, roughly, would be thirty years' purchase.

59787. Don't you think that thirty years' purchase invested at 3½ per cent. would provide him with his net income?—In many cases it would not.

59788. What would?—In the case of very good grazing lands it would not, because there is such a high rent obtainable for them for accommodation purposes, which is far above their value, taken by themselves, or for permanent agricultural lettings.

59789. What do you think would?—It varies greatly.

59790. Would it go as high as thirty-five years' purchase?—I believe in some cases it would, that is, 35 years' purchase of the agricultural rent. Very good grass land sometimes, especially when there is a small proportion of it in a district, brings, for accommodation purposes, a rent much in excess of its agricultural value. A man has, say, a rough farm of 150 to 200 acres—a well-sheltered farm that he can keep cattle on in the winter very cheaply; then, if he can get a good grass farm to turn them on to for the summer to fatten, he will probably be able to pay from thirty to fifty per cent. more than the agricultural value of the good grazing farm if it were taken by itself.

59791. That is the sort of land you would not acquire?—That sort of land is the last we would seek to acquire, or if we did acquire it we would keep it for grazing purposes, which is much needed for poor districts.

59792. Then it would return you what you gave for it?—It probabaly would in grass.

59793. Sir John Colomb.—Take Connaught as the area of the Board, the more you take away that land and sub-divide it the higher must be the price of the remainder, because you reduce the supply and do not diminish the demand.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—I thought it was part of our case that you were diminishing the demand

* See p. 46

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 22, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—That is a very important point. As conditions now exist there is this value for accommodation land?—To a limited extent, and merely in respect of the best class of land.

59794. You diminish that land by the operations of the Board?—Yes.

59795. Do you diminish the demand in a corresponding degree?—You do, to some extent; because the people who now pay these high prices for these good grass farms are graziers who have tracts of poor land, and if you take away the poorer land from them they will no longer be seeking to obtain the richer land for their accommodation purposes. If I have a rough farm that can feed stock cheaply in the winter I can pay more for a good grass farm to fatten these stock in summer than an agricultural tenant could pay, and more than I could pay if I did not require it as a supplemental farm to my rough farm on which I feed the cattle and sheep during the winter.

59796. CHAIRMAN.—You have said that the Board have given an average of 27 years' purchase?—For all the land that they have bought.

59797. Twenty-seven years' purchase of what?—Of the estimated fair rent.

59798. Taking the poor law valuation, what was it?—It was, I believe 29·5.

59799. CHAIRMAN.—Is not the proper way to put it to say that the average price paid for grass land was 29·5 years' purchase of the poor law valuation?—That has been argued ever since I gave my evidence. That is not a standard of value I would adopt.

59800. The landlord knows nothing about your estimated fair rent?—No, but the land comprises arable land, plantations, and bogs. The average price paid for all our untenanted land was 29·5 years' purchase of the poor law valuation. When I was giving my evidence we were not able to give you the valuation of the untenanted land which we had bought, because we attached no importance to the poor law valuation. The Estates Commissioners, however, kept the poor law valuation record. You required us to supply our figures on the same basis for the purposes of comparison, showing what the poor law valuation of the land we bought was. We got the information at considerable expense, but when you have it now it is very misleading, because I could show you several cases there where there was a valuable tract of bog for which we paid about 300 years' purchase of the poor law valuation, and got it cheap. That is to say if a bog has a poor law valuation of threepence an acre, and is near a densely populated area where bog is scarce, it would be cheap at £4 an acre, although its poor law valuation is only threepence. If we paid £3 15s. an acre for it, that would be 300 years' purchase of the poor law valuation. At £5 an acre it would be 400 years' purchase. When you introduce price of turbary, plantations, and buildings into our figures and bring out an average, it is quite misleading as to the price paid for the agricultural land. In the same way with a plantation for which we may pay £20 an acre for the timber on land with a poor law valuation of four or five shillings.

59801. You say the 29 years' purchase includes bogs, plantations, and everything else?—Yes, and my way of putting it is to say 27 years' purchase of an estimated fair rent is the price paid for the agricultural land in our purchases.

59802. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Yes, but take since the Land Act of 1903, you know the land you bought, the arable land you bought, you can describe it?—Yes.

59803. Can you give us the poor law valuation for that?—I do not know if that has been ascertained for you.

Mr. Callan.—There is no distinction made in the statistics submitted by the Board between the different classes of land, and it has not been found possible to get further information.

Witness.—If the tenement valuation is not assessed upon it you cannot get it. You can only get it in the gross.

59804. CHAIRMAN.—Taking the grass land you have bought since 1903?—We paid 27 2/3rds years' purchase since 1903.

59805. Take that grass land which you have bought: Do you think that at 27 years' purchase, plus the bonus, it would not give a man his net income?—Not on the 3½ per cent basis—his past net income.

59806. Not on the actual class of land you have bought?—No.

59807. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—But that is by voluntary agreement?—Yes.

59808. The landlords sold at a loss on their net income?—There is no landlord I know who would not be prepared to exchange his income from untenanted land to an investment at 4 per cent. If you were given an opportunity of inspecting the rentals you would find that the income from grazing rents in most instances within the last twenty years is considerably reduced.

59809. Mr. BRYCE.—Our evidence is to the contrary?—I am afraid that that is not so, except in a very few places, and that you did not get reliable evidence or proofs. I am speaking of what I know from my investigation of rentals. We bought an estate near Tulsk the other day, and the figures given for the past twenty years as to the rental of the grass farms were entirely reliable, and the rental showed a considerable shrinkage. This is the case in the great majority of rentals of grazing farms submitted to me.

59810. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—That is so extremely important that I should be glad if you could suggest any way in which we could arrive at the exact facts of the case, and the extent of the fall in the rents from grass lands in Connaught?—I think that landlords are quite conscious that evidence of the kind would be against their interests, and if the facts were not as I state they would have come forward with their rentals to prove that those rents had not fallen.

Sir JOHN COLOMB.—The present feeling about grass lands is that a landlord would not come forward and say anything about them one way or another.

59811. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—Have you any means you can suggest to us of ascertaining whether the rents of grazing lands in Ireland have been practically maintained during the last twenty years; you say not as far as your experience goes?—Not in the West of Ireland; but I say that the very best land has suffered least, but that all kinds of grass lands have depreciated for the last twenty years very much, for the last ten years not so much, and for the last five years still less.

59812. Mr. BRYCE.—You think it has nothing to do with the land falling off owing to not having been tilled and owing to nothing having been put into it?—I think that has a great deal to do with the falling off in the productivity of inferior land. Store cattle have been continuously fed on it and no manure has been put into it, and I know men who would have to prove by their books that their rental from grass lands has fallen considerably in the last twenty years, and I do not believe that there is a single landlord in Connaught, except in the case of a few very good grass farms well situated, who is not getting a lower rental from his grass farms than he has received previous to fifteen years ago.

59813. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—As I understand, you compare the present day with twenty years ago and say that there has been a great fall?—Yes.

59814. But you say that in the first ten years of that period the fall was more considerable?—Yes.

59815. And since then it has been righting itself?—No; it has not gone up, but the fall has not been so great.

59816. The diminution in letting value has been inconsiderable; it has not yet recovered the standard of twenty years ago, but the tendency is to increase?—No. What I meant to say is there has been a substantial fall in the rental of the grass farms in the West of Ireland during the last twenty years, that the fall was greater up to ten years ago than it has been for the last ten years, but that it has been falling and not appreciating all the time. The fall has been less considerable for the last five years, and in several places I know the grazing rental has been stationary for a few years past.

59817. Mr. BRYCE.—In other words, I suppose you would put it in this way, that a rental of £100 came down to £80 in the first ten years, to £70 in the five years following the first ten years, and to £65 in the last five years?—Yes; to illustrate it——

59818. CHAIRMAN.—If, during the last five years, the rents have been stable, a retrospect of the income derived for the last five years ought to show you fairly what the letting value of these lands is?—The last five years would be a truer test than the last ten years.

The Commission adjourned.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23RD, 1908.

AT 11.0 O'CLOCK, A.M.

In Westminster Palace Hotel, London.

Present:—The Right Hon. the Earl of DUDLEY, G.C.V.O. (Chairman); The Right Hon. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I.; The Right Hon. Sir JOHN COLOMB, K.C.M.G.; JOHN ANNAN BRYCE Esq., M.P.; WALTER KAVANAGH, Esq., D.L.; ANGUS SUTHERLAND, Esq.;

and WALTER CALLAN, Esq., Secretary.

Mr. HENRY DORAN further examined.

Jan. 23, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

59819. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Doran, will you continue your statement?—If the annual grant to be made to the Board for the improvement of estates is to be based on an average net loss, it will be necessary to leave the Board free to exercise reasonable discretion in the selection and grouping together for each year of estates that will involve a large loss, a small loss, and an intermediate loss, and it will rest with the Board to exclude from purchase estates or portions of estates which they consider may be sold without special treatment. The percentage of loss incurred in the treatment of the estates purchased and prepared for sale under the Act of 1903, may be stated in round figures as:—9 per cent. loss on Class A:—Tenanted estates, which comprised 76 per cent. of the cost price of all the estates dealt with. 20 per cent. on Class B:—Tenanted estates which comprised 15½ per cent. of cost price of all the estates dealt with. 30 per cent. on Class C:—Untenanted lands, which comprised 8½ per cent. of cost price of all the estates dealt with. If the Board dealt with one-third of a million worth of untenanted lands, the loss at 30 per cent. would be on £333,333, equal to £100,000. If 10 per cent. of the tenanted lands were of B class £20,000 would be necessary to cover the loss in dealing with them. These losses for Class C and Class B estates together, which only make up 43 per cent. of the million's worth of property, would amount to £120,000, or 12 per cent., on the £1,000,000; so that if the average loss permitted be 12 per cent. on one million's worth of property, 33 per cent. of C and 10 per cent. of B estates would involve a loss of £120,000, and 57 per cent of the A, tenanted estates, should be dealt with without loss.

59820. You say that the loss on B and C would be £120,000 a year?—That is, if the proportion of these estates I have indicated be under treatment. Suppose the output is a million a year, and one-third of that is untenanted land, on which you must lose 30 per cent., that will cost you £100,000. If you also deal with 10 per cent. of the poorest class of estates you cannot deal with those at less than 20 per cent. of loss, and then 57 per cent. of the entire volume of estates should be dealt with without any loss if the loss per million be limited to £120,000.

59821. I don't understand how you are going to do that. You lost 9 per cent. on them in the past, how are you going to do what you propose in the future?—I was just going to explain if you only allow 12 per cent. on a million, that is £120,000, you would not be able to deal satisfactorily with a million's worth of property in a year, because you would have to pass more than half of it through without any loss. You cannot deal with migration on an enlarged scale at a less loss than 30 per cent. You cannot deal with the very poor estates with a less loss than 20 per cent. You may be able to deal with the better class of the A estates at, perhaps, 5 or 6 per cent. on the enlarged area. It will, I think, be admitted that the class of estates most in need of attention are the poorest tenanted estates and the untenanted land, and the loss on these would be at least 20 per cent. and 30 per cent. respectively, while it would not be possible for the Board to pass through their hands such a large proportion as 57 per cent. of the estates dealt with each year without incurring a loss. For these reasons, with others, I consider that at least 15 per cent. should be allowed on each million's worth of land dealt with, and *for the purposes of an estimate* it might be apportioned as follows:—33 per cent. of C equal to £333,333, at 30 per cent. loss, £100,000; 10 per cent. of B, equal to £100,000, at 20 per cent. loss, £20,000; 57 per cent. of A, equal to £566,667, at 5·3 per cent. loss, £30,000, so that on the £1,000,000 the loss would be £150,000.

59822. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—The B estates are the poorest?—The estates that are in the worst condition, the least resourceful, and the most difficult to improve.

59823. Will there be only 10 per cent. of the total land bought?—I don't think you can deal with a larger proportion in a million's worth each year. The area of these estates is not indicated by the percentage. Take, for instance, the Berridge Estate, in Connemara. It covers a huge area, but its value is not much, comparatively.

59824. That is altogether an exceptional estate—practically the worst. Take the lands that you have got down in Connemara and Mayo, very thickly inhabited, congested estates. These are the places that you want to improve. They are the great bulk of the thing you want to deal with. Do you say that they will be only 10 per cent. of the million?—Only 10 per cent. of the value is represented by the worst estates in my proposal.

59825. Your object is to improve this B class of land, and the C class of land is merely for the purpose of improving the B class of land. A is comparatively good?—Yes.

59826. And you contemplate that 57 per cent. of what you pass through must be comparatively good?—A great deal of B is land that although you lose 20 per cent. on it you are able to deal in a less satisfactory way with it than you would with A, because it is less resourceful. It is land like the Carna Estate, the Berridge Estate, and Inniskea Island; and these are estates which, although you spend a large sum of money on, you cannot very much improve, and they will not be much relieved by migration. They are more remote from the open areas. They are the worst class, and will, I believe, remain bad, no matter what the Board does for them.

59827. So B is not the class of estates to direct attention to?—B is the class of estate of which the poorest districts are wholly or mainly congested, and in which you must look to other means, such as industries, to benefit the condition of the people. Personally, I have no hope that you will be able, through land alone, to improve the condition of the congested districts so as to appreciably improve the standard of comfort of one-half the people in it. I don't think it is possible, in the absence of industrial employment. All you can do is to ameliorate the conditions of life of the population on Class B.

59828. CHAIRMAN.—Your estimate, after all, can only be a very rough estimate, because there must be a great many estates in Class A which, if you had them in hands, would require a considerable amount of treatment. A, I understand, are the estates which are better than B, and have a little untenanted land on them?—The description I give of A is estates on which there was more or less agricultural land

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

available for migration and enlargement of holdings. They are poor estates, that are mainly tenanted. Then my description of B is very poor estates, on which there is little or no agricultural land available for migration or the enlargement of holdings. Where such an estate is remote from the open areas, from the grass lands, I have all along told you I don't believe that migration can be looked upon as a practical remedy for their relief. I don't believe it is a practicable proposal to transfer from these areas a sufficient proportion of the occupiers to the open areas to relieve the congestion in B. Consequently, no matter what you do with the land, the population of B will remain poor, unless other sources of revenue than the land are made available, such as the establishment of industries, and development of fishing, where the B class is maritime, and all the maritime districts are of the B class. Unless you can provide other means of income for the inhabitants of these areas than from the land alone, they must remain poor; but even if this cannot be done to a satisfactory extent, the condition of the people would be much ameliorated if the lands are striped and their houses improved, so that they may have decent, comfortable homes for their families, even though the able-bodied men had to migrate to other parts of Ireland or Great Britain for portions of the year for remunerative employment.

59829. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—My point is sufficiently made. You say that the loss of 30 per cent on C and 20 per cent. on B comes to £120,000 You think the price of the B would be only one-tenth of the million?—I mentioned that proportion for the purpose of making an estimate. In practice it will not be possible for the Board to preserve these exact proportions of A, B, and C estates. The Board may have a smaller proportion of untenanted land and a larger proportion of bad estates that they should deal with. I don't believe they can get untenanted land in the proportion of one-third of the whole, and they may have a larger proportion of bad estates, that is B, that they could deal with. If they cannot buy one-third of C estates they can buy more of B, because C and B are the two that involve the largest loss, and in that way they may be able to keep the loss on the gross annual output within a fixed average. Having regard to the difficulty of securing fixed proportions of the different classes of estates for each year's operations I have come to the conclusion that the proposal to fix the grant to be given to the Board at a percentage of the value of estates sold each year is objectionable, and that it would be preferable to have an annual grant placed at the Board's disposal, to be applied at the Board's discretion, to meet the loss incurred in the treatment of estates purchased by them subject to the general understanding that they would sell each year about one million's worth of estates. The Board must be trusted to exercise discrimination in the selection of estates for purchase, and to avoid the purchase of any estates that they are not justified in buying. If it is a Board that cannot be trusted to do that, or will not do it if trusted, it will undoubtedly fail to discharge its functions efficiently.

59830. Does not that entirely conflict with your previous statement, that what you wanted to buy was whole blocks of country, consecutive blocks of country, and not to choose and pick here and there; that if you want to deal with congestion as a whole in the West of Ireland you must abandon the practice which you have hitherto followed, of picking and choosing estates because of their inferiority? That was quite right up to the present, but for the future you would have to buy whole blocks of country, and proceed geographically?—That is not in conflict with my proposals.

59831. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—Is not that, as Sir Antony has pointed out, the very basis of the claim for compulsion?—Yes. That ought to be done.

59832. Therefore, you would have to proceed by blocks and no longer get an estate here and an estate there?—Yes. Consequently, with that procedure actually in my mind, I tell you that, in practice, it may not be possible to get the proportions which we have in the list, A, B, and C, submitted to you.

59833. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—You have a proportion of 57 per cent. of A, equal to £566,000. What is the relative value of land in A as compared with land in B? Why have you given to A £566,000 and only £100,000 to B? You say you buy a million's worth of land, which will be distributed in classes A, B and C, and of that land Class A will represent 57 per cent.?—No; that is the proportion that A forms of the estates we have dealt with under the Act of 1903 and have sold or are ready for sale. 76 per cent. as the actual figure for the estates that were purchased under the Act of 1903, and are either sold or ready for sale, and I use these figures to make an estimate.

59834. Then this is no indication of the future?—It is, to this extent—that it shows you what loss you will have to incur in future in the treatment of A estates and in the treatment of B and C estates respectively.

59835. That would be true if your purchase of land in A was appropriate to the amount you had bought in B and C, but under the Act of 1903 is not it a fact that you have been buying a lot of C land, keeping it up your sleeve, as it were, for the purpose of improving B?—Yes; we bought a great deal of A land in the hope of improving it by the addition of C land, but we have rather avoided the purchase of B land in remote districts, because we had neither the money nor other means to substantially improve it.

59836. Then this is not a very clear indication of the future. But my point is this. I want some information. You say that you ought to appropriate 33 per cent. of the million to the purchase of C land and 10 per cent. to the purchase of B. B is the thing you want to improve. You ought not to buy more of C land than is necessary for the improvement of B?—And of A.

59837. You say A will be passed through without any loss, as a rule?—No. My point is, we shall be able to do very little good for B by migration. Consequently A and C go more together. B stands almost alone for treatment, and the value of these figures is this: that these bad estates which we have dealt with under the Act of 1903 are, in my opinion, fair types of bad estates in the congested districts, and the loss which we sustained in treating them is very much the same loss as we would have to incur in dealing with similar estates in the future; and I tell you that we have been unable to do anything substantial in the way of migration from B, and have not put these estates into a satisfactory condition; but in the case of A we have done comparatively well for a great deal of A, but we would do a great deal better if we were able to get untenanted land to the proportion of one-third, and especially untenanted land more adjacent to A than we have been able to get it under our present powers; and I explained yesterday that we were obliged to sell some A estates although quite near untenanted land, simply because we could not acquire the untenanted land required to enlarge small holdings.

59838. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—With regard to Class B, leaving them, as you say, in an unsatisfactory condition, was not that due to the fact that you had neither power nor money enough to acquire land to enable migration to be carried out from B, and that, therefore, you were not in the position in which you would be if you were given increased power and increased means of acquiring land?—Not so much with respect to B estates, for the reason that the majority of them are situated in places remote from the grass areas, and the fact that a considerable number of the occupiers of land there will not migrate.

59839. Mr. BRYCE.—And would not be fit for it if they did?—At present they would be the least fit.

59840. CHAIRMAN.—That, to my mind, is one of the chief difficulties in the plan on which you propose to proceed. The B estates are the estates in the worst condition?—They are.

59841. And where congestion and poverty are greatest, and where really a radical cure is the most necessary. If you put on one side any possibility of creating industries then the only real remedy or cure for those estates is to remove a large section of the population, supposing they would go?—You have to assume that they would go, and that you could get the land, and that you could plant them under conditions in which they would be likely to succeed.

59842. The only radical cure for these estates is to remove a large section of the population. I quite understand that at present that is difficult, first because the people have not realised the advantages of migration, and, secondly, because they are too backward to succeed always on the land on which you put them; but if you buy any large proportion of those estates at present, and re-stripe them and re-sell them, you make it impossible in the future to deal with them when perhaps a more enlightened spirit might be abroad. Would not it be better to leave those estates for the present, and confine your

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 23, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

attention more to A and C, and allow time to elapse, in the hope that as regards those on B estates agricultural instruction may benefit the people, and may educate them, and that they may be more willing in a few years to follow the example of people from A, and migrate. But the more you deal with B estates now the more you make it difficult to deal satisfactorily with them afterwards?—No; I think that is a fallacy, if you will excuse me for saying so. I think our treatment of B estates will make it much more easy to deal with the landholders in the future if they are willing to migrate, because it is mainly these estates that are held very much in mixed or rundale plots. We give a landholder in two, or sometimes three, parcels an equivalent value of land to that now held in, perhaps, twenty or more plots. Then we improve the houses, or get the occupiers to improve them themselves. We never build a house for landholders, we do not remove in the striping, but we have a Houses Improvement Scheme in operation, under which they get free grants, usually from £7 to £10, for building a new house, or smaller sums for substantial improvements to existing houses carried out in accordance with our specifications, and we also where we consider that the holding would be security for it, add a sum to the sale price of the holding up to £25, which we give the landholder as an advance, to be repaid in the annuity. When we have striped the B estate and had many of the houses greatly improved, if half the people leave afterwards all that would have to be done would be to add the vacated stripes to the stripes of those who remain, and to do this little or no fencing or expenditure would be necessary.

59843. Then you don't think that buying an estate and re-striping and re-selling it to the tenants will render more difficult future migration operations?—By no means. It is only a stage towards progress. On the Dillon estate, if we can get suitable land, I know many tenant-purchasers who will migrate, and there will be no trouble in amalgamating the vacated holdings with the adjoining striped holdings.

59844. Will that entail pulling down a lot of houses that have been improved?—There are many bad houses there yet.

59845. Mr. Sutherland.—In the event of joining two holdings you would select the better house?—Yes; the better house always.

59846. Sir John Colomb.—Carrying out that policy involves this, that you are using up C for the amelioration of A?—Yes.

59847. Therefore, when you come in the process of time to tackle B you have used up the means of doing it because you are restricted within a given area, and there is only a certain amount of land available?—Then if we have done that we have utilised it for the people who are more suitable than B, and who are most convenient to the C area. There is no reason why B should have priority over A in the distribution of the grass lands.

59848. But it does involve the outlook of B, beyond amelioration in its internal conditions, being stereotyped as it is?—Yes, and B will be more or less stereotyped no matter what you do.

59849. Have you thought of how you can justify a large expenditure of public money that is going to leave the worst places practically untouched. We want so many millions for the work of improvement. How do you justify, in your own mind, a deliberate policy of leaving the poorest estates with only a minor amount of amelioration?—You would be perfectly satisfied with the results, in my opinion, when you consider the only other alternatives. The only other alternatives are migration or emigration. The migration of any considerable number of the B occupiers is out of the question. It cannot be done at present. If the first and only object to be secured was to provide economic holdings for the number of landholders who could obtain a fair living from B, the surplus population would, I believe, emigrate, if they got liberal assistance, and this would be less costly than the substantial amelioration of their condition if they remain where they are. I think, however, very few people will argue that emigration, even from B estates, ought to be facilitated. In those poor areas if you can settle a peasant in an allotment, using the English word, where he has a home affording decent accommodation for his family—turbary for fuel, the grazing of a couple of cows to give milk to his children, and where they can keep fowl also—the great bulk of them, although poor, will lead happy, contented, and good lives, and will always be a very valuable asset to Ireland if it can employ them as labourers, and when Ireland cannot employ them they are a valuable asset to England as migratory labourers.

59850. Then it might be asked why spend all this money on A when you are not spending any on B?—In Class A the remedy is in the neighbourhood of the landholders' homes, and in B the same remedy is not at hand, and you must either improve them in other ways, or facilitate them in clearing out of the country altogether.

59851. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—What you propose to do for B is this. You propose to put the farmers into the very best condition to receive the advantages from the Department of Agriculture, to make them ready for intensive cultivation you cannot extend the area?—Yes; to spend money freely in assisting to provide decent houses to live in, in fact, I would spend more money on the houses than on the land. Nothing appears to have a more stimulating or elevating effect on the habits of a peasant's family than a good house, when the members of the family feel proud of it, and take a pleasure in keeping it and the surroundings of their home clean, tidy, and cheerful.

59852. Mr. Sutherland.—How were the houses in Carna built?—The landholders built most of them themselves. We only build new houses for persons we move in striping, and the people put up four times as many houses themselves under our House Improvements Scheme and parish committee grants, which are very small. I would aim at having B the part of Ireland containing our reserve of surplus labour, and have the people decently housed. If they have to go to England as migratory labourers the conditions under which they travel to and fro and are housed in England should be supervised, and made as less irksome as possible.

59853. I think you made a remark that you were not able to deal satisfactorily with the migrants whom you had dealt with already; does not that mean you had not been able to do enough for them in starting them on their own holdings?—That was not to day.

59854. In answer to Sir John?—I don't think so.

59855. Is it the case you would like to be in a position to do more for the class you migrate before you leave them to their own resources?—No. I think we have done enough for them; but I think after we put them on the land they should get assistance in the way of agricultural education and direction. That is the further aid that I would ask for them. The Board must be trusted to exercise discretion in the selection of estates for purchase, and to avoid the purchase of estates that they are not justified in buying; for if they do not do this, and that their output be confined to estates worth one million a year, the length of time which would be required to deal with all unsold properties in the counties containing congested districts would be very long. I anticipate that there will be very great dissatisfaction at the delay necessarily incurred in the transfer of the ownership of holdings on poor estates in the counties containing districts when the output is confined to one million a year, and it occurs to me that legislation should provide for dealing if necessary with a larger output of estates needing treatment when the owners willing to sell and the tenants willing to buy represent property of value in excess of the million a year.

59856. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—There will be no legislation at all, as I understand, but an executive order allocating a certain amount of money to the Congested Districts Board?—The untenanted lands dealt with were sold at the prices paid for them. The tenanted estates paid at least two years' rent, and some of them three or more.

59857. Sir John Colomb.—Before they got the vesting order they were tenants of the Board for two or three years is that what it means?—Yes; we got two or three years' full rent. I mention this in connection with the loss. That was a source of revenue. It is hardly necessary to point out that a similar class of estates cannot be similarly dealt with at the same loss if the untenanted land is not purchased at a price at which it can be sold, or if the revenue from the land while on hands be substantially reduced.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

59858. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—But it never has been yet?—No; but I am anticipating that you may yield to the demand that the Board should only charge interest the same as the Estates Commissioners.

59859 Then the loss would be more?—Yes. I may, however, point out that the loss on the estates purchased under the Act of 1903 includes cost of surveyors, paymasters, and clerks of works, which ought properly be charged to administration. I am informed that the Estates Commissioners do not charge to any estate the cost of surveying, valuing, management, or engineering expenses, in fact, none of the expenses incidental to the supervision of the improvement or resettlement of estates, except the wages of gangers, who superintend the workmen.

59860. What are they charged to?—They are charged to administration.

59861. Is it in the votes?—Yes; in the votes of the Land Commission. All the office charges are in the vote for the Land Commission. To sum up now quite shortly, what I want to impress upon the Commission is that the estates we have dealt with under Class A are typical, so that you may take it for granted that the loss to be incurred on the A estates will not be much less than it has been in those estates if the same amount of work is done. It will be no less for B, and it will certainly be no less for C. So if the Board have to proceed geographically, as Sir Antony MacDonnell said, in the purchase of an area of a county, we may have an excess of A over B, or of C over the others. If we cannot preserve the proportions which are indicated by the results of the estates in the list, I submit that it would be objectionable to fix the revenue of the Board on a varying percentage of loss, and that you ought to suggest, "We shall give you £150,000 or £170,000, and you are expected to turn out a million's worth of property per year." If, on the other hand, you allow the whole of a county to be purchased and sold by the Board, as was suggested yesterday, the percentage of loss would be lower on the output.

59863. Do you think that would be a practicable thing, to spread the percentage of loss on improving estates over the price of estates which don't want any improvement, and on which no improvement is effected? What you want to know is how much it costs you to improve these estates; what percentage of the purchase money does it cost you to improve these estates? Why, in order to have the fictitious appearance of a small percentage of loss, should you bring in estates which are not improved at all?—I don't argue in favour of it at all but what I say is that the percentage of loss will vary if estates are purchased of which a large part do not need treatment, and also with the proportions which A, B, and C form in the volume dealt with.

59864. But what I thought you were coming at was to indicate or suggest to the Commission a percentage of loss which would take count of the varying losses incurred on these different classes of land, and that then you would be able to suggest to us a percentage of loss which we should be safe in adopting?—I am in a difficulty, as you have not settled whether the Board shall purchase portions of estates not needing treatment. I was asked yesterday what suggestion I had to make with regard to an estate, portion of which was congested and needed treatment, and ought not to be sold without treatment while the remaining portion was of a character that did not need treatment. My suggestion was that the Board should divide the property into two sections, scheduling one as a separate estate to be sold direct to the Board, that is, the part needing treatment, and informing the owner that they were prepared to declare the other portion to be a separate estate for direct sale. The difficulties in that were fully discussed, but I have thought over it since, and I have now to make this proposal that in all cases where the Board find that portion of an estate needs treatment they shall signify to the owner their willingness to buy the entire estate, that having arranged with the owner a price for the entire estate, they will then divide the estate into two sections, one being the part needing treatment, and the other being the holdings that may be sold direct, and they will get each of the tenants occupying the holdings which they do not desire to purchase to sign an agreement to buy his holding at a specified price, provided the sale to the vendor is completed.

59865. There is no difficulty in that. That is the universal practice of the Estates Commissioners?—And the Board would not get any of the other tenants to sign agreements. That is where the Estates Commissioners' procedure would not suit us.

59866 It would suit us; but, however, go on?—We would not get anyone whose holding we were going to alter, enlarge, or interfere with in any way, with regard to turbary or anything else, to sign an agreement, but we would agree with the landlord for the bulk price. We would get all the tenants whose holdings we proposed selling at once to sign agreements, and the week after the estate was vested in the Board they could get each of these persons to sign agreements, and that portion of the estate would be dealt with without any loss.

59867. Mr Kavanagh.—If the tenants would agree?—They will agree before we purchase.

59868 Before you have made your offer to the owner?—Yes. We value the estate. We get into touch with the tenants. We ascertain what the tenants on one section of the estate would be prepared to pay, and what on another, and all that. We have always to do that in estimating the price of an estate After negotiations with the tenants we make up the gross price, which we ask the landlord to accept, subject to the condition that three-fourths of the tenants on the portion to be sold direct will sign undertakings to purchase at the prices making up the offer. Then we go back to those tenants whose holdings we do not propose to alter, and we say to them, "We are willing to sell your holding to you for twenty-two years' purchase, or whatever it is, provided the sale goes through. If you sign an undertaking now we will put you on interest at once, and ask you for no rent." They will always be prepared to do that, because tenants whose holdings are not to be improved are willing to buy without delay, and there will be no difficulty in practice in arranging that

59869. Take the case where the landlord will not take your price?—He holds on as landlord, or the Board buys the whole estate by compulsion.

59870 Sir John Colomb.—Take an estate on which a portion needs improvement and another portion does not, and on which the grass land is in the owner's possession, and unless you can agree to a price for the grass land it is obvious that the thing must fall through?—Yes, unless you agree as to the gross price.

59871. That is so?—Yes.

59872 But meantime you must have the grass land. What are you going to do? Are you then going to apply compulsion in order to get the grass land?—In that case it would be the duty of the Board to apply compulsion for the entire estate.

59873. That is, the landlord having had the desire to sell his estate, and contemplating selling it direct, has come to the Board Then the Board takes up your procedure, and the landlord finds that he has drawn upon himself all the powers of compulsion by his own act; and because he intimated that he thought he could agree with his tenants and get a certificate, that is the result?—No. It would be only in cases where the entire or any portion of an estate needed treatment that the Board would make an offer of it. If the entire of an estate is one that the Board do not desire to purchase, that does not need treatment, they immediately notify the owner that they are prepared to certify it to be a separate estate, and he can deal with his tenants himself.

59874. Take the case of an estate on which the tenanted land does not need treatment, but on which there is grass land in the landlord's own possession?—I call that an estate needing treatment. If an estate contains a substantial area of grass land for division I would call that treatment. I would say that estate should not be sold direct. I think everybody agrees it is not desirable to facilitate direct sale on estates with untenanted land.

59875 Sir Antony MacDonnell.—There is an estate, 80 per cent. of which needs no treatment and 20 per cent needs treatment. You get agreements from the tenants of the 80 per cent. before the thing is declared an estate and passed through. That is an easy matter, as you say?—Yes.

59876. Because if the holdings do not want improvement the tenants will naturally jump at not only the reduction of price on sale, but also at being put on interest instead of paying rent. That is the universal practice of the Estates Commissioners in operations under Section 6, but there is, furthermore,

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan 23, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

the practice in regard to the 20 per cent. that needs treatment, because if it be treatment of a very detailed kind, migration, and so on that you refer to, perhaps there might be difficulties in some cases, not in all; but, as a rule, the Estates Commissioners indicate to these tenants, this 20 per cent., what method of treatment they propose to apply to their holdings, stripping, re-arranging, and so on. They make out a scheme—I am not talking of what I do not know—and the whole thing goes through, for the 20 per cent. as well as for the 80 per cent. When the whole thing goes through they set to work to carry out the scheme, but the thing is settled beforehand?—That is to say, they get all these tenants to sign.

59877. Yes. They get the twenty tenants to sign for the improved holdings?—The result is that the Estates Commissioners have declared that the procedure is so difficult that they have not dealt with congested estates.

59878. I don't know anything of the sort. They stated they have not bought congested estates for an entirely different reason, connected not with the tenants but with the price payable to the landlord?—I won't attempt to argue it, Sir Antony.

59879. I know what I am talking about, because I have made it my special object within the last three weeks to look into it?—Then there can be no objection to my proposal at all.

59880. None at all?—Except this, I am sure you agree with this, that you should not allow the people whose holdings you are going to alter next week to enter into agreements to buy their holdings at a specified price.

59881. I don't object to that. I don't object to your leaving them out?—The Board have found it impossible in many cases. For instance, where a man's holding has surplus turbary. His rent may be £3, and he might have 100 acres of bog. If he signs an agreement to buy his holding without any reservation, he will not permit the turbary to be allotted to other tenants.

59881A. I don't object to your reserving it; but there are very many cases in which you can do it before the sale?—There would be difficulty if agreements were signed.

59882. Not at all, it is the common practice?—We don't enter into agreements to buy before the holdings are rearranged.

59883. Mr. Bryce.—You say you think that fixing the revenue of the Board on a percentage of the loss would be altogether objectionable, and that you would prefer an annual grant. You mean an annual grant of a varying amount should be stated each year on an estimate?—I think it would be better to name an amount. Allow them, say, £150,000 or £170,000 to lose on the treatment of estates.

59884. You mean that you would put in a new Act a certain annual sum, or would you allow it to be fixed each year on an estimate?—I think it would be better to put a sum in.

59885. In the Act?—In the Act. If you have to apply for it annually it must be on the basis of a percentage or it must be to cover your loss.

59886. It is a matter of great importance, because it is the kind of thing you cannot change if it is in an Act without another Act?—Yes. I have come to the conclusion that the proposal to fix the grant to be given to the Board at a percentage of the value of the estates sold each year is objectionable, and that it is preferable to have an annual grant placed at the Board's disposal, to be applied at the Board's discretion.

59887. Chairman.—You must base your grant on something?—On the output, which involves a loss of from 14 to 18 per cent. per million output of mixed estates.

Chairman.—You must base it on the percentage of loss, I think.

Mr. Bryce.—That is what Mr. Doran says he does not like.

59888. Sir John Colomb.—Mr. Doran does not object to the percentage being based on the annual grant, but the Board being tied down in its application in a particular year to a particular estimate for a particular year?—Yes; on the ground of insisting that they are to turn out a million's worth to be allowed so much.

59889. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—If you got whatever percentage emerges from all these calculations you submit to us the Board shall be at liberty in any year of its operations to lose 17 per cent., leaving to them the allocation of the loss, 100 per cent. in one case, nothing in another, 5 per cent. in another, and so on—would not that meet it?—I would like it were made perfectly clear in making their recommendation that the Commission had come to the conclusion that very variable losses were necessarily incurred in dealing with different classes of estates, and that the percentage named by them was the average for all classes of estates, so as to prevent people from clamouring for the average percentage of loss in the treatment of each estate.

59890. Mr. Sutherland.—How would that prevent them?—You would have that answer.

59891. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—You must trust to the Board to arrange that?—Yes.

59892. Mr. Bryce.—If that is the actual method by which things are arranged by the Estates Commissioners it amounts to the same thing as you ask for, because you take your output, you allocate certain grants that amount to the percentage, you are not bound in each particular estate as to the percentage. There is nothing objectionable in the other method?—If it is clearly stated that on some estates there will be a very small loss and on others a very large loss, and that the average would work out at a certain amount, I would consider it far more satisfactory, but I may remind you that the Estates Commissioners' section is in doubt.

59893. You mean the interpretation. It is working all right, but the working of the Act is doubtful?—I am informed it is not being worked. It is 10 per cent. on congested estates, and they have only purchased a few congested estates.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—They have only bought four on account of the use of the words, "with the consent of the owner," in section 6 (4).

59895. Chairman.—To turn to another subject—the parish committees. We have been told that the parish committees are doing good work, principally with regard to the improvement of houses, the removal of manure heaps, and so on. If you have a sufficient sum of money to enable you to buy blocks of land geographically, as has been suggested, does not it seem to you that on those blocks which are bought there is no longer any need for a parish committee?—No. I don't take that view at all, because you want to deal with the blocks of land rapidly, in two or three years. During that time the landholders are in the Board's employment carrying out estates improvement works, and comparatively few of them do anything on their own holdings or to their houses, before the estate is settled, and we cease employing them. In the idle time of the year they do the work under the parish committee schemes; and the house improvement scheme in most of these poor districts is too slow to permit of its being withdrawn on sale of the estate.

59896. Yes; but my point is while the property is in your possession cannot you take steps to insure that these houses will be improved?—It would be too big a job altogether, and too slow. You could not get them to do it quickly enough. It would enormously increase the loss, because you cannot force the people to get the houses improved in that interval while we have so many of these men employed. Much more liberal assistance is given to tenants under the Estate Improvement Schemes than under the Parish Committee Schemes.

59897. It seems ludicrous that you are able to buy an estate, with all the powers of a landlord, unfettered by Acts of Parliament of all sorts, and with an enormous sum to lose on the improvement of the estate, and that at the same time it should be necessary to have another organisation so largely financed?—While an estate is in hands we only aim at carrying out the works that are absolutely necessary. A great deal remains in the way of improvement of buildings and other works that are very desirable.

59898. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—Don't you already overlap the work that the parish committee does?—No.

59899. The parish committee has been largely concerned up to the present with the improvement of houses?—The scheme extends over the entire congested districts, it is not confined to estates purchased by the Board.

59900. I know that, but you give advances for the improvement of houses; you have regular schemes for the improvement of houses?—We have

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

59901. So far as that scheme operates, and so far as the parish committee schemes are restricted to the improvement of houses there is overlapping?—No; because it is not possible for a man to get a grant under a parish committee scheme and a grant under the houses improvement scheme, when we are dealing with the estate on which the holding is.

59902. You take steps to prevent overlapping?—Yes. The conditions which we offer for the improvement of their houses while we are dealing with the estate are much more favourable than the conditions under the parish committee schemes. A fair number take advantage of the better conditions when we are dealing with the estate, but a great many cannot be induced to carry out desirable improvements while we have employment for them at full wages.

59903. CHAIRMAN.—You keep an estate, as a rule, two or three years?—Yes.

59904. In three years don't you think that everything that could be done reasonably in the way of the improvement of houses and so on could be done?—No, very often we have every man on the estate who is willing to work employed for two years, road-making, and at drainage and fencing.

59905. They are not engaged all the year round. They are only engaged in the winter, and can work at their houses the rest of the year. They are not always away?—When they are at home we employ them at road-making and drainage in the summer and fencing in the winter, and other things. We do everything we can to take advantage of our house improvement schemes in every way we can, yet a very large proportion of bad houses remains on many estates.

59906. Then the parish committee extends beyond the Board's work?—Yes. It extends to the whole congested districts.

59907. Even to estates that the Board don't intend to deal with?—Yes. If they are within the congested area.

59908. Is it within your experience that since the Act of 1903, since the creation of the Estates Commissioners and the granting to them of powers to create tenancies among sons of tenants that the work of migration has become more difficult?—Much more difficult, because before then there was none of this agitation in the neighbourhood of grass farms that is now so serious. There was no cattle driving nor active hostility against what are called "strangers" getting holdings on the grass farms.

59909. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—You say that that has arisen since the Act of 1903?—Yes.

59910. Cattle-driving and all that agitation to prevent the letting of grazing farms have been known long before 1903. The same object was taken up by the Plan of Campaign in 1888, when the new League was organised?—I can only speak from my own knowledge of cattle-driving, and I don't know any place where it was practised before 1903.

59911. CHAIRMAN.—Have there not been a good many new tenancies created for sons of tenants around Castlerea?—Yes. In fact the seventeen new holdings in the neighbourhood of Castlerea have been given to sons of tenants, except two.

59912. By the Estates Commissioners?—Yes.

59913. The Estates Commissioners have created tenancies in that locality among sons of tenants, and have made the work of migration on adjacent lands more difficult?—Much more difficult for us, and for themselves, too; because now what happens is the landholders adjacent or in the neighbourhood of those grass lands who have one or more sons openly state that their sons have a prior claim to any stranger for a holding. We have had a very strong letter from a man near one of these grass farms who has four fine young fellows, sons. He declares that nobody will be allowed to take an acre of the land adjoining his farm until his four sons get four holdings. That is only a threat, but still the agitation is very effective at present in the way of frightening people away.

59914. I don't want to ask a question which in any way makes your position difficult or will create any friction between departments, but don't you think that the Estates Commissioners having, perhaps, been forced to create tenancies among sons of tenants, having become committed to that policy, to a certain extent, it would be very difficult for them if they were charged with the work of migration in Connaught to concentrate sufficiently upon the relief of congestion? Would not they be continually hampered by what they have already done, and would not they be continually hampered by claims from the sons of tenants for land?—I don't think so, if the law were altered. Nobody finds fault with the Estates Commissioners in the matter, and I consider that it was their function and duty to provide these holdings under the administration of the Act of 1903.

59915. That is not my point. What I mean is unless you could put back the clock and take away from them the duty of giving land to sons of tenants, which, personally, I don't believe for a moment you could do, would not you be very much hampered in dealing with grass lands?—Unless you could do that you certainly would; but I would like to say this, that, in my opinion, unless the power is taken away from the Board also of giving holdings to sons of tenants, even the limited power they now have, they will find it impossible to carry out migration on a large scale.

59916. You have not given any holdings to sons of tenants?—No; except four, in the County Galway.

59917. My point is, there is a difference between you and the Estates Commissioners in this way—although you may have the power to do it you have not, as a matter of fact, done it?—No.

59918. And you are regarded by public opinion as the authority principally concerned with congests?—Yes.

59919. Whereas the Estates Commissioners have given, perhaps, perfectly rightly, under the Act, land to sons of tenants much more largely?—Yes.

59920. And are regarded by public opinion as the body who will give land to such people?—And whose duty it is to plant the lands with such persons.

59921. If you put the responsibility on them of carrying out migration in Connaught won't you find that their history in the matter handicaps them in dealing with congests?—They cannot do it satisfactorily if the law remains as it is.

59922. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—I deem it my duty to call attention to the terms of Section 2 of the Land Purchase Act of 1903. It runs in those terms "In the case of the sale of an estate advances under the Land Purchase Acts may be made for the purchase of parcels thereof by the following persons—(*a.*) A person being the tenant of a holding on the estate; (*b.*) a person being the son of a tenant of a holding on the estate." That is the second duty of the Estates Commissioners—first to give land to tenants of holdings on the estate, and next to give it to the son of the tenants of a holding on the estate?—They don't confine themselves to sons of tenants on the estate. They have given holdings near Castlerea to sons of tenants on the Dillon and De Freyne estates purchased by the Board.

59923. The Estates Commissioners are appointed to carry out a certain duty under this Act, and are fulfilling their duty by giving holdings to sons of tenants. They would not be fulfilling their duty unless they did do that?—No.

59924. You are appointed a body for the relief of congestion. You have no power under your law to give a new holding to anybody who is not a congest?—You have.

59925. You have no power under the law to give a holding, where it is possible to relieve congestion by giving a holding, to a man who is not a congest, and thereby deprive a congest of the land?—But you have power to give the surplus land to sons of tenants.

59926. You have power to apply the remnant. If any remnant is over you can apply it?—Yes.

59927. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—What I wish to point out in reference to the remarks of Lord Dudley is that the Estates Commissioners appointed to perform a duty have performed that duty. If the law is changed, and imposes another duty on them they will perform that other duty, and their method of performing their former duty will not in any way militate against the effective performance of their duty if their duty is altered.

59928. Sir JOHN COLOMB.—At all events, you individually knowing the work of the Board, do think that this Commission should express its strong opinion that in no case in a congested district should any untenanted land whatever be appropriated to anybody but congests, for congestion cannot be relieved if the sons of tenants are to have any of that land?—Most emphatically, I am of that opinion—not only in the congested districts, but in all the counties containing them.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan 23, 1908

Mr. Henry Doran.

59929. Suppose the whole of Connaught—we will take Connaught alone—were handed over to the Congested Districts Board, then you consider it would be most desirable that the Commission should express a strong opinion that sons of tenants should be ruled out; I mean to say that there should be no claim, or that if appropriations of any of this available land are to be given to sons of tenants, it means that congestion cannot be relieved?—Yes, and that agitation will continue.

59930. You want to be backed, so that you can dismiss the claim by saying: "We cannot do it; there is the law based upon the Commission report; it is not our fault; don't blame us; you must get the law altered if you want us to do it"?—Yes.

59931. But so long as there is a doubt about it, so long as there is this vague idea that it is within your power, your work is blocked?—Yes; blocked mainly by the young people in the neighbourhood of the lands.

59932. Mr. Bryce.—Suppose you buy these blocks of land, and find that owing to agitation you cannot migrate your people, on account of scrimmages arising and so on, what are you going to do?—I would not buy huge blocks of land in that way without feeling I was on safe ground, and knowing that the land acquired was passing satisfactorily to persons who had surrendered land for the relief of congestion.

59933. Mr. Sutherland.—In any case you have no power to give any land except to congests?—We have.

59934. Sir John Colomb.—You have given us in your memorandum your experience of estates dealt with since 1903, and of course it is valuable as far as it goes as an indication. Can you suggest to the Commission any possible way of arriving at a conclusion as to what is the distribution of these estates within the area, that is, what proportion of the estates in Connaught, say, are A, what proportion are B, and what proportion of the estates are C?—I have not material from which I could supply a correct classification.

59935. Is there any machinery or means by which within a reasonable time an approximate idea can be formed by the Commission as to what is the real condition of distribution of these estates within the area that is proposed to be handed over to the Congested Districts Board. Can you give us a clue to find that out?

Mr. Kavanagh.—Don't limit the question to Connaught.

Sir John Colomb.—Take the eight counties. Can you give us any information enabling the Commission to estimate approximately what is the proportion of A, B, and C in that district?

59936. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—You ought to be able, having regard to the valuation. You know how many under £4, how many between £4 and £10, and how many over £10?—That would not separate A and B.

59937. All C would be over £10?—Yes.

Sir John Colomb.—That would only give you holdings, but not estates.

59938. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—You could get an indication by looking through the valuations of estates?—The only way in which you could get anything like an indication would be from the Valuation Office; or you might get it by communicating with the owners who have not sold their estates in the counties containing congested districts.

59939. There is no means of getting that in time at our disposal?—The only other way would be from the General Valuation Office Returns. If you don't get it fairly accurate it might be misleading. It would take a long time.

59940. Chairman.—As it is, all your calculation here is hypothetical?—The figures of the properties A and B that I have given you are from actual experience, but I have added one-third proportion of C land. That is the only hypothetical element in the figures supplied.

59941. You tell us that from your experience you have lost 9·4 per cent. on Class A?—Yes, and 21 per cent. on B. That is the average of all estates in each class.

59942. You estimate now you are going to lose 5 per cent. How do you estimate you are going to get down from 9 to 5?—Because in dealing with the whole county there would be a larger percentage of A of better quality than the estates dealt with in my schedule A.

59943. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—You draw an inference of the whole state of the country you are going to cover from these examples. If these examples had been taken geographically you might have been able to draw an inference of the sort, but these examples have been taken cheque board all over the country, and you have taken up the worst estates?—I would ask you to accept my statement that the estates are types of the estates A, B, and C that you have to deal with, but we would be likely to have a larger proportion of better class A estates than those in my list.

59944. I admit that, but what I want to know is the distribution: how are those estates typical of the whole state of the country?—I am not able to tell you in what proportions.

59945. How can you say so many estates of the A type in those counties?—I have told you I cannot say that, but I think that all the estates to be dealt with, excluding the good estates that would be allowed to be sold by direct sale in the way I suggested yesterday or this morning, will be of the types A, B, and C.

59946. Mr. Sutherland.—It would be all the same for your purpose if you had only three estates? It was only for the purpose of comparison of classes?—If I am sure they are fair types, if you adopt the suggestion made this morning of allowing the Board to buy an estate, selling directly the holdings not needing treatment, you will only have included in your output of a million entire classes of estates similar to those I have given, and your percentage of loss will not be less than these figures, except to the extent to which a better class of A estates will come in.

59947. Chairman.—You explained that in future the loss on Class A will be less than it has been, because you will find better estates of Class A in the wider area?—Yes, in a larger proportion.

59948. By Class C you say you have lost 25 per cent.?—That is an easy case to estimate. There is no doubt about that at all.

59949. Why do you put it down at 30 per cent now?—Because you are coming into the open areas, with a small population, where labour is much dearer, and the cost per holding will be more. I instance an estate where we had to import thirty labourers to a grass farm near Castlerea, and to provide special accommodation for them in an out-building, and we have them there still. They are costing us at the rate of 3*s*. a day. Each has a payment of 3*s* a day, besides finding them in milk and fuel. In other places the wages is 2*s*. per day.

59950. Sir John Colomb.—The ground for the claim of compulsory powers to the Board is based upon the necessity of the Board dealing with large blocks of districts?—Yes.

59951. That is the whole ground of contention, that compulsory powers are necessary. Can you tell me this: what is your view, assuming you got these powers, and that you had the increased money and increased powers, as to how you are going to select one district and exclude others? Can you give me any notion of the principle to determine the action of the Board? In selecting the districts in order of precedence, what claims would you take into consideration?—I would consider that they should operate in all the counties at the same time. As to the mode of starting, that would be regulated by the particular district in which they start, and by the estates offered to them at the beginning of their operations.

59952. Then your determination of a district to be operated upon would depend upon the voluntary offer of the landlords to sell?—Yes, in the first instance. I would begin with the voluntary purchases certainly. I would extend from the first centre. I would have several districts. Just take the County Mayo. I would, say, have a list of ten centres in Mayo scattered over the county, with ten resident officers, and each of them would begin with one estate, and they would widen out their field of operations until the ten met, working in different directions.

59953. And the selection of the ten centres would depend upon a particular landlord offering to sell?—It would, at the outset; and then, when you establish yourself in a centre, where the landlord has offered to sell, and you come in there under favourable conditions, without making any trouble, the adjoining landlord will probably offer. That is our common

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

experience Whenever we get an estate we are almost invariably offered adjacent estates. We gradually enlarge our area. We are not in a hurry to apply compulsion at all, and we ought not to be. It would be only when a landlord does not offer an estate that it is desirable to acquire, either tenanted or untenanted, that you should apply compulsion.

59954 But you may take it that the centres have been established by existing operations?—Probably that would be, to some extent

59955 You take one of these as a centre, and say, "We are going to enlarge this area." Do you suggest your first duty would be to approach the next landlord?—Yes. We have no trouble in doing that. Landlords very rarely make objection to a discreet inquiry as to their willingness to sell If we get to Belmullet, or any other centre you like, the first thing we do would be to inquire from the agent or owner of desirable estates in the neighbourhood if he could see his way to offer the estate to the Board, as we were operating in the district, and I believe that by proceeding quietly like that we would make satisfactory progress in our negotiations

59956 Suppose the landlord says no, do you suggest going off somewhere else, where the landlord says yes, or do you proceed to enlarge the district by exercising your compulsory powers?—If he says no, and the estate needed treatment, I would recommend the Board to apply compulsory powers.

59957 Mr Bryce.—Don't you think your estimate would be very seriously out if you cannot make an estimate of the distribution of the A, B, and C estates? You may try to arrange it in the proportion which you have estimated by buying a certain number of estates of each class, but if, coming towards the end of your operations, you find an accumulation of B estates your estimate will be utterly out?—We would have to abandon the purchase of the others for the time and lose all we had on the B estates, and the output would be less.

59958 In the long run, if the percentages are not in accordance with the experience you have already had of the percentage of A, B, and C you will come to a time when you cannot get it right, even by delaying your purchases?—It would be regulated by the Board

59959. You may work it from year to year during a great many years but you will come to a time when the accumulation of estates will leave them nothing to average it with. The classification of holdings is no guide, because it depends on the nature of the estate?—I don't see how that would come.

59960. It must come if you don't know the proportion?—We do know when we inspect an estate.

59961 But if you don't know the total number of A estates you are going to deal with? Suppose you are going to settle the question of congestion, you may find that the total number of B estates is much greater than you imagine, how are you going to do it; for if you endeavour to arrange it by the proportions A, B, and C you will come to a moment when nothing but B is left?—If that were to happen then I would cease buying C and apply my whole revenue to the treatment of B I should say migration; and migration cannot be used much in connection with B. That is much on the seaboard I think when you limit your output to a million or a million and a half I think you should be always able to so group your estates that you could keep them within the estimate.

59962 Yes, if you are perfectly certain that there is a certain number of A and B estates to be sold and a certain number of C lands to be still available; but if you find that you have been seriously out in your experience, and that this output you have had is not representative of the total number, you will come to a particular moment when you will find that you can no longer maintain that proportion of that particular class?—I feel quite certain as to the existence of Class B and the certainty of being able to buy them, but as to the certainty of acquiring one-third in value of Class C I am doubtful. If the proportion of B or C estates as compared to A estates was higher in any year than the proportion I suggested the output would be correspondingly reduced.

59963 Sir John Colomb.—Does that mean if you got a million a year for the purchase of land you would only buy in a year one-third of a million of Class C?—I would not say in any one year, but I would not have more than a million's worth of Class C in hands at any time We are empowered to have that

59964. Mr. Bryce.—You are doubtful of getting the proportion of C so long as you are restricted to Connaught. If you were enabled to go out to Westmeath there would be no difficulty in getting enough of C?—You would have the further difficulty of the people.

59965. Chairman.—I want to ask you whether you think you have made a sufficient allowance in estimating the loss on Class C, for the fact that with compulsion you will have a large amount of grass land, at least an adequate amount of grass land, and, therefore, you will be able to offer a substantial inducement to large people to migrate. You told us yesterday that one of the reasons why dealing with land in Class C was so expensive was that you had not been able to move the larger men. You had to remove the small men, which entailed two sorts of expenditure—one, a considerable number of extra houses, fencing, and soforth; and the other, that the occupation interest of the people moved was not very great, and, therefore, you were not able to recover that?—If we can get larger people to go our loss will be less.

59966. If you have an adequate amount, one-third of grass land, and a good deal of that land lying in proximity to the estate that you are treating your difficulties in that respect will be lessened?—They will

59967. Won't your loss therefore, be considerably lessened?—It would be.

59968 You have actually put the figure in Class C higher for the reasons assigned—the wages of labourers are higher than they have been. You have increased the figure from 28 to 30 per cent., and you say that is because of the increased cost of labour, and so on?—That is my reason.

59969. Have you, as a set-off against that, made sufficient allowance for the advantage of being able to move bigger men?—No; I have not, perhaps, made sufficient allowance, because I am doubtful if they will go, and again, there is a very small proportion of big men even on the A estates in the congested districts, and there are none at all in B practically. You may remember I informed you when giving my evidence on the Dillon Estate, on which there were 4,300 tenants, with a poor law valuation of £20,000 a year, that there were only 254 tenants of £10 valuation and over. They were the only big men there who would come out Within the last three weeks we migrated about twenty men from the De Freyne Estate on to grass lands near Castlerea, and they were nearly all men with small holdings. We gave them from £16 to £25 holdings.

59970. You don't believe you will get any substantial relief?—We will get more than we did, but we will not get a sufficient number to seriously affect the proportion of loss.

59971. Therefore, you don't consider that the fact that you will have more grass land in proximity to the estates you are treating will have a very great effect?—It will have some effect, as I have mentioned several times, if we can get the larger men out.

59972 At any rate according to the estimate you have given us it will be a smaller effect than the opposite effect resulting from the increased cost of labour?—I am afraid it will.

59973 Sir John Colomb.—I asked just now if you could give us any clue to ascertain the probable proportion of these three classes I ask another question now Can you give us any approximate idea or tell us how to get it, as to what is the amount of the untenanted grass lands in the eight counties in acreage or valuation that are available for the purpose of the Congested Districts Board for migration?—The best information you have on that is that already furnished to the Commission under the heading "non-residential holdings." That is the only information available of any value.

Sir John Colomb.—Does that give us the information, because although they are non-residential holdings they are not all suited for migration.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—It has to be taken with many reservations.

59974. Sir John Colomb.—Assume we spend a million a year in taking up land, and spend one-third of that on the acquirement of this land, I want to know roughly or approximately how many years it would take to absorb all the grazing lands of the eight counties?—The best estimate you would have for that would be from this return of non-residential tenements in all the counties containing congested districts

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 23, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran

59975. Do you mean Mr. Ginnell's?—No. The one I supplied.

59976. That is the maximum amount of information you can give us to enable us to form an idea of what quantity of land will have to be dealt with?—That gives you full information. It is the outside estimate, with the poor law valuation given as well as the acreage.

59977. Mr. BRYCE.—Since you gave your evidence in the autumn of 1906 in Dublin have you changed your opinion? You said at that time you thought the willingness to migrate would increase. Since that time have you found that that is so?—The desire to migrate has unquestionably increased; only for the agitation in connection with the lands to be divided——

59978. You mean that if it were not for that agitation you could see your way to getting migration done on something like the scale you would like to see?—Yes; on a much larger scale. In fact, in face of the agitation the desire to migrate has increased.

59979. There is another point I would like to hear your views about: that is whether the Commission should give any recommendation with regard to the maintenance of improvements. There are already signs that all these things which you have done on the Dillon Estate, with regard to the improvement of drainage, the clearing of land, and so on, are going back, and it is quite evident that they must go back when your controlling hand is taken away. The whole object and purpose of your work will be largely defeated if these improvements are not maintained and cease to be operative, and the security of the State will be affected also?—That is so.

59980. Have you any suggestions to make with regard to the means of maintaining those improvements?—I would like to say that a great deal of most useful work was carried out by the Board, namely, arterial or main drainage and accommodation roads. On these, especially the drainage, they have made a very large outlay with most satisfactory results, but there is no provision made for the maintenance of these drains and roads, and probably before twenty years they will be nearly as bad as they were, as the people will not maintain them themselves.

59981. At least at present, eventually they might get into the state of realising the necessity of doing it, but at present they won't?—I believe so.

59982. We found on Clare Island a main drain stopped up already?—Yes; that requires annual maintenance. As regards the maintenance of drainage generally, my idea is it should be all put under the district or county to deal with, with power to levy a rate on the holdings benefited for the maintenance.

59983. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Main drains?—All main or arterial drains.

59984. Not field drains?—No. Arterial drains. We have never made any drain on a tenant's holding. We always say, "Our business is to give you a chance of improving your holding, and we are willing to make a main drain, which is outlet for the drainage of several holdings." We never make a drain for the benefit of one holding. Neither do we ever make a road for the benefit of one tenant. We do make it when it will serve a number. We always act on that principle. I think the drainage so important that the maintenance of all drains should be placed under the control of the county authority, and the area within each drainage district should be subject to a levy for maintenance.

59985. There was a subject to which Sir John Colomb devoted a good deal of attention in connection with the Parish Committee schemes. He constantly pointed out that a good deal of the work done by the Parish Committees should be done by the local sanitary officers. It was not done by the sanitary officers, and the Congested Districts Board subscribe funds towards assisting the Parish Committees to get these very things done which the sanitary officers ought to have done. Now you propose that this maintenance of drainage should be put into the hands of the local authorities. What security is there that the local authority will do any better than the sanitary authority now does?—I gave evidence before the Arterial Drainage Commission, in which I suggested that the county or district authorities should maintain the drainage systems under the supervision of a central official authority, which I called a Public Works Department. I think this very important, because if no provision be made for the maintenance of these very useful works the security will be seriously impaired, and the tenants will not be able——

59987. I quite approve of your plan. What I want to get at is this—don't you think that putting the County Councils in action will be the business of a central authority?—Yes. That is why I mentioned it.

59988. And a central authority like the Local Government Board can come down on the County Councils, and make them do a thing. There ought to be some body who ought to be able to make the County Councils work?—Yes. That is why I went back on my evidence, and explained to you that I had suggested such an authority, and that it should be the duty of such authority to see that the drainage system of the country was properly maintained, and that a rate should be levied from the lands benefited to cover the maintenance.

59989. That ought to apply to the roads also?—It would be more difficult to make it apply to the roads.

59990. But you have just said that if the roads are not maintained in twenty years they will be as bad as before you made them?—That is so.

Mr. BRYCE.—How are you going to secure that that is to be done?

59991. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—If you get them under the county scheme they will be looked after?—A great many of the roads the Board have to make are accommodation roads, and will not be taken over by the county because they only affect a limited number of people who want access to a bog or a village, and the difficulty of getting the maintenance of these roads thrown on the county authority is very great, because only those who use the roads ought to be required to pay for them. That is the general feeling. I will submit my suggestions for the maintenance of these roads later on.*

59992. Mr. SUTHERLAND.—I may point out how they do it in Scotland. We make no new road or give no grant for a road unless it comes to us through the road authority?—Then you would have no, what we call, accommodation roads, for access to detached parts of holdings, or to bogs or villages on your estates.

59993. We get applications from townships in the West of Scotland to get a road made. We write back—"You have your own County Council. It is the road authority. Put it through them, and we will enter into an arrangement with them." That is the way it is done. We say to the County Council—"We will give you a grant towards the road on condition that you hold it." There are hundreds of miles of road done in this way?—The Board have contributed thousands of pounds to roads of that class—that is, roads that can be dealt with by the county. A road running to a bog is disqualified by law, unless it connects two public thoroughfares.

59994. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Unless the County Surveyor certifies that it is of public utility?—Yes. It occurs to me at this moment from what Lord Dudley said yesterday about the Congested Districts Board making a contribution in connection with agricultural developments through the Department of Agriculture, that it might be possible for the Department of Agriculture to make some small contribution from that fund towards the upkeep of these roads in the interests of agricultural development.

59995. Mr. BRYCE.—It is a case where a stitch in time saves nine. If there was somebody whose business it was to go about and see that these roads were all right the probability is that the people at the time, if it was pointed out to them, would with a little combined attention, do what was required?—Yes.

59996. But as it is nobody's business it is not done?—Yes. The road may be impassable in five years.

59997. All the people in the county should get accommodation. These people are paying *pro rata* for the roads of the county, and they have no roads: is that fair?—It is not.

59998. Mr. KAVANAGH.—To put it on the county you would have to strain the law, which says that until the County Surveyor certifies it to be a work of public utility there cannot be a new road.

* See p. 45

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

59999. Mr. Bryce.—Just one point in connection with that It applies also to the maintenance of the other works on which the Board has spent money. I don't see how you are going to get a public authority in there at all. My own notion about it was, so long as the Board exists in its operations, for twenty years or any time you like, that it should be given by the new legislation, control over all the work that it did, and all the money it has expended in the past and is going to expend in the future, that, in other words, the Board should have a certain continuing power in certain officers to see that all the money it spent on roads and drains has not been expended uselessly, and that if these works are not put into the hands of another authority—as there is in everything else a certain authority to see to their maintenance—then the Board should have a certain power of control over these works in some way or another, and a power to keep up the improvements, and to see that the houses are kept slated and thatched rightly, and so on; otherwise the expenditure that has been incurred is useless?—I don't think there is so much danger of allowing houses to go out of repair.

60000. You think that the individual comfort of the people would come in there?—Yes. I think that there is not the same necessity as there is in the case of the roads.

60001. I don't think there is?—But I think the new Board should have compulsory powers to call on the people who were accommodated by a particular road to improve it if it needed repair, and in the event of their failing to do so, to put it into proper condition, and make a levy for the cost.

60002. I would like to know whether you have any suggestion to make with regard to a clause in a bill restricting the occupier from mortgaging his holding with a view to preventing the land from getting into the hands of a gombeen man. You expressed a desire to have such a provision before. Have you thought what form that provision should take, and whether it would affect the credit of the people with the shopkeepers and their general credit, so as to interfere with the development of their land?— ?—I don't think it would interfere with their credit. The credit of a small landholder is largely regulated by his personal character and reputation. The proportion of small holdings sold for debts is very small.

Mr Sutherland.—What is the practice under the Homestead Acts?

Mr Bryce.—We can get particulars of that by applying to the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office

60003 Sir John Colomb.—What is your view of this suggestion? In creating these new holdings there is a certain loss incurred which the State would have to pay What do you think of the proposal to exercise pre-emption when the occupier of that holding wishes to sell, at all events, pre-emption to the extent of the loss incurred by the State? Take one of these cases that you gave us yesterday, of a holding created at a net loss to the State of £181. That holder wants to sell Do you not think that the Imperial Exchequer has the right to say, "We will exercise this sort of pre-emption, before we will sanction that we must be paid £181"?—I think it would not be unfair, but it would minimise the inducement to migrate. I should remind you that the gross loss was £189, and not the net, after deducting value of occupation interest of the surrendered holding

60004. Here is a return of non-residential land (*produced*).* The upper part relates to congested districts That is untenanted land, non-residential. If I add up to the total of the acreage at the foot of the column, of all those columns, will that give me the acreage and extent of the non-residential lands within the congested area?—Yes. Within the counties containing congested districts.

60005. If I add up the rateable values it will produce a corresponding result, and will give the total rateable value of untenanted land?—Yes.

60006. If I take that, roughly, as a mere approximation, and multiply it by thirty, I get the purchase value of the untenanted land in the counties containing congested districts?—Yes; of the non-residential holdings.

60007. If I then divide that by three, as the one-third of a million, it will give me a rough, glimmering of an idea how long it would take to absorb all the untenanted land in the congested district counties if £300,000 a year were appropriated for the purpose?—It would.

60008. Chairman.—Take the question of the cost of land staff. If the Board is to turn out a million's worth of land a year, how much land do you think would it be necessary for them to hold?—I would think they ought to hold about three millions worth.

60009. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—How long would the million's worth of land be under treatment?—On an average, the tenanted land two years. As regards the untenanted land, my idea is the Board ought to have about a million as stock in hands, if they can, so as to give a larger field of selection to migrants, selling one-third of that each year, and only buying one-third.

60010. Then you would want to hold three millions worth of land?—Nearly.

60011. Chairman.—There seems to be some difference of opinion between Father O'Hara and Mr. Mitchell and yourself with regard to the capabilities of the present staff. Mr. Mitchell told us in his evidence that the present staff could turn out £400,000 worth of land annually. Father O'Hara said he thought it could deal with considerably more land than it had been dealing with—that is, an average of £200,000 a year. Do you agree with that?—No. I understand that Father O'Hara and Mr. Mitchell meant the capabilities of the full establishment as provided for, but which was not then brought up to its full strength.

60012. Is it up to its full strength now?—Yes, but in any case the present staff, which is up to its full strength as agreed to by the Board, would not, in my opinion, be able to turn out more than £300,000 a year, one year with another.

60013. That is what it was formed for?—Yes.

60014. This present staff, as brought up to its full strength, costs more than £30,000?—It costs about £31,000 or £32,000

60015 Sir Antony MacDonnell.—That includes the office?—Yes. That includes the office.

60016. I got the figures from Mr. O'Brien the other day. He told me it was between £18,000 and £20,000 for the outdoor staff?—Yes.

60017. Does your indoor staff cost £9,000 or £10,000?—Yes

60018. If the £30,000 includes office staff as well as outdoor staff, to increase the staff to a size that would turn out a million you would not want a very large increase in the indoor staff?—Not a proportionate increase.

60019. You say the present cost of the outdoor staff is £20,000?—Yes.

60020. To turn out a million, what increase would be required in the outdoor staff?—I would say it would have to be two-and-a-half to three times what it is at present; three times I would say, because I would like to turn it out more rapidly, and a great deal of time will be taken up inspecting estates and negotiating for purchase—from £50,000 to £60,000, including clerks of works, surveyors, and paymasters, which are now charged to estates

60021. Have you made out a statement of the number of inspectors and various other officers?—I have a list of them here.

60022. Chairman.—Can you make out in detail exactly what the cost of a staff would be to turn out a million's worth of land in the year?—Yes. It will be based largely on what we are doing.

60023 You can do that and tell the number of inspectors you would want and everything else?—Yes

Mr. Mitchell.—I have asked for some more figures, which I shall have to-morrow. It will be about £60,000 That is including both indoor and outdoor

Chairman.—That would cover everything, to turn out a million's worth of land—the whole thing would cost only £60,000?

Mr Mitchell—I shall know a little more correctly to-morrow. It will be about £60,000. I am not including clerks of works, surveyors, and paymasters.

Chairman—That is not an increase of £60,000?

Mr Mitchell—The present cost of administration in connection with estates is about £25,000.

Chairman—Indoor and outdoor?

Mr. Mitchell.—Yes. I am assuming an increase of two-thirds on that. Assuming that that is the expense of putting through £330,000 worth of land, that is, one-third of the whole, I am assuming that the other two-thirds, that is the increase, would not cost at quite

* See pp. 48-9.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 28, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

the same rate. If they did it would be £75,000. The increase that I estimate is £35,000; that is, in connection with estates

CHAIRMAN.—Can you give us a regular statement on that?

Sir ANTHONY MACDONNELL.—Showing on one side the existing staff and on the other the proposed staff?

Mr. Mitchell.—Perhaps I can give you the particulars I have with a view to your criticism.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.—You can only give the outdoor staff?—(*Witness*)—That is all.

60024. CHAIRMAN.—Can you and Mr. Mitchell give us a detailed statement, showing on the one side the present staff, and, in your opinion, the amount of land that the staff can turn out?—I am prepared to do that now.

60025 And in the next column you would detail the number of people who would have to be employed?—I have done that for the outdoor staff. If you wish to have it with the other I could put them together to-night and submit it to-morrow.

60026 Mr. BRYCE.—Those figures given by Mr. Mitchell do not include the industries business, only the administration of estates. We want it for everything?—(*Witness*)—I have all the figures for my own department (*produces papers*). You will pardon me for reminding you that I made no provision at all for paying more for land than the Board could sell it at, and I believe that that is likely to happen. I have prepared particulars here of the prices paid by the Board for tenants' interest, and they had to pay rather more for the land than they would be able to re-sell it at, and the Board would have to lose that difference. In the same way, if they had to pay more for untenanted land than twenty-seven years' purchase the loss would have to come out of the Board's fund or some special fund.

60027. CHAIRMAN.—That is with regard to the percentage of loss?—Yes. I forgot to mention that the idea I had was that, to begin with, we should have an inspector for each county, and one chief inspector, who would constantly supervise the inspectors.

60028. How many counties would you allow for?—Nine.

60029. Would you want one in every county?—Not at the beginning. In some counties we might want two inspectors. The inspector in charge of a county would have under him men to carry out the detailed work. It is not possible to get men competent to discharge the duties that we have to carry out without some training. They are not to be had, because, outside the Estates Commissioners' staff or my staff, you cannot find men who have had experience of this work. I propose to place the new men under the direction of the officers who have had some experience.

60030. Mr. BRYCE.—Have you got any suggestion to make with regard to the prevention of the amalgamation and the prevention of the sub-division of holdings. The amalgamation of holdings is more or less connected with the question of mortgaging and alienation. I think it would be desirable that you should send in a memorandum on that?—Perhaps it would be better, and on the question, maintenance of drainage and roads.*

60030A Sub-division, amalgamation, alienation, mortgaging, and also maintenance?—Very well.

60031 Mr. KAVANAGH.—Would not you give a power of pre-emption to the State?—When holdings in counties containing congested districts are put up for sale the Board should have the right of pre-emption.

* See p. 45.

Commission adjourns.

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 24TH, 1908,

AT 11.0 O'CLOCK, A.M.

In Westminster Palace Hotel, London

Present:—The Right Hon. the Earl of DUDLEY, G.C.V.O. (Chairman), The Right Hon. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I.; The Right Hon. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT, G.C.B.; The Right Hon. Sir JOHN COLOMB, K.C.M.G.; Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL; JOHN ANNAN BRYCE, Esq., M.P.; WALTER KAVANAGH, Esq., D.L.; ANGUS SUTHERLAND, Esq.:

and WALTER CALLAN, Esq., Secretary.

Mr. HENRY DORAN further examined.

60032 Sir FRANCIS MOWATT (*in the Chair*).—You have prepared, I understand, a statement of your present staff and of the increased staff which you believe would be necessary for the increased land work, which has been discussed by the Commission?—Yes.

60033. Perhaps it would be better to get on paper a slight statement of the different stages of the work that you do now, and then we will compare the different conditions?—Yes.

60034. The purchase of land is really initiated by correspondence between yourself, as chief land inspector, and the owners?—Yes.

60035 As a matter of fact, do they address their original application to you or does the original letter come first before the Board?—As a matter of procedure, I always arrange that they should send their proposal through the secretary. Having arranged with an owner that he will offer his estate to the Board, I suggest to him to send a proposal on the prescribed form to the Board. I either send him the forms myself or request him to apply to the secretary for them.

60036. The original negotiation does not therefore, in point of fact, concern the Board. It comes to you, and you put it in form before it reaches the Board—is not that so?—Yes; as far as the mere offer is concerned; but I never open negotiations for an estate without getting the authority of the Board. The procedure followed is, that when the vendor makes an offer, through the secretary, of his estate, before I take any further action in the matter, I submit a short report to the Board as to the advisability or otherwise of the purchase of the estate, chiefly from the particulars supplied by the vendor, when I have no personal knowledge of the estate. If it is an estate apparently suitable, I ask the Board's authority to be allowed to inspect it. Then, having inspected it, I make an estimate of its value, go into full details, classifying the rental—first term, judicial, second term, and so on. I also value separately the land, if any, in the owner's hands, and I furnish to the Board a report as to the maximum price which I could recommend the Board to offer. I also furnish at the same time an approximate estimate of the cost of re-arranging the estate, and the Board, having considered my report, decide upon the offer to be made.

60037. That being still in the affirmative?—The offer then issues. It is prepared by the solicitor, and is issued by the secretary, and signed by him at the time.

60038 Then you resume the negotiations with that authority?—As a rule, we don't make a second offer. It has not been the practice of the Board to attempt anything like haggling in the matter.

60039 But when you have sent in your report to the Board, they accept your recommendation that a certain price be offered?—Yes. I take no further action.

60040. If the owner declines, so far you are stopped?—Yes.

60041. You take no further steps?—Not usually.

60042. If he makes an offer or suggestion, that again is carried out by the chief land inspector, under the authority of the Board?—Yes.

60043 That is, so far as the purchase of an estate is concerned?—There is some further procedure. The Board's offer is always conditional on verification of the particulars supplied, and when the owner accepts, the next step is to get all the tenants together, inspect their last receipts, and verify the rental.

60044. Is that done by one of the five assistant inspectors, referred to here?—Yes. It is done by one of those. Then, if there is a discrepancy, as very frequently arises, that is to say, if the rent and arrears in rental are not identical with the rent which we find from the receipts has been collected by the owners, we communicate with the owner, and arrange for the re-adjustment of the purchase price.

60045. I won't take you through steps so detailed as that, but the subsequent negotiations, up to the stage of purchase, when that is carried out, are in the hands of yourself, the staff of assistant land inspectors, and assistant inspectors?—Yes.

60046 Then the legal steps of the purchase are carried out under your solicitor?—Yes; the completion of the purchase. The originating request has to be prepared by the vendor's solicitor, in communication with the Board's solicitor, and is lodged with the Land Commission.

60047. Your next appearance on the scene is when the purchase is effected?—Yes.

60048 It then falls back into your department, and you consider the question of re-settlement and re-arrangement?—In the meantime I submit to the Board a detailed estimate of the receipts and expenditure for the period from purchase to re-sale. In the first instance I only submit an approximate estimate. After it has been arranged to purchase we have to go into all the details—the roads to be made, the holdings to be striped, and the houses to be built, and all that; and we supply a detailed estimate of the future receipts and expenditure on such estate from the time of purchase to the time of re-sale; and the Board having approved of that, I am allowed to go ahead, and complete the works within the limits of the approved expenditure, but I cannot exceed that expenditure without an authority from the Board.

60049. Those works are carried out by your clerk of works, I suppose, and superintended generally by your inspectors and assistant inspectors?—Yes.

60050 As regards that particular estate, you hold, so to speak, a watching brief throughout?—Yes.

60051. When the different improvements, re-settlement, and re-arrangements are carried out, the thing passes into the hands of the tenants, and, so far, your function finishes?—Yes. We have a great deal of detailed work in connection with the striping in getting tenants to surrender to us their old holdings and enter into tenancies of new; a great deal of legal work also is incidental to these arrangements.

60052. I need not carry you into these details. There are at present one chief land inspector, one assistant, four inspectors, and five assistant inspectors—that is eleven altogether. What do you consider the amount of land or the value of land which those eleven men at present are capable of dealing with?—With the assistants, I estimate that the present staff could deal

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan 24, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran.

with about £300,000 worth of property per year, if we were allowed to proceed without interruption, which we have not been permitted to do for the past three or four years. We have been frequently asked to reduce expenditure and delay works owing to possibility of funds running short. Then we have great delay owing to the legal difficulties you heard so much about. If we could proceed systematically and without interruption I believe my staff could turn out about £300,000 worth of property in the year of the average class we have dealt with.

60053. Speaking very roughly, I think you have heard that the suggestion before the Commission now is that you should deal with something like £1,000,000 worth of land a year?—Yes.

60054. That is apparently three times as much land as you are dealing with now?—Yes.

60055. Should you say that the extent of additional land with which you would deal would, in equal proportion, increase the amount of work?—Not as regards the duties of the superior officers. I propose reorganising the staff, and having nine inspectors

60056. You have got four at present?—Yes; and five assistant inspectors. My view is to have an inspector in each county; or in a county in which there would be a great deal of work to do, we would probably have two inspectors We would require one superior officer in each county or other defined area whose duty it would be to attend to the work of that district, very much as I try to do over the whole area, and to report as to the suitability of estates offered, and all other matters that the Board's ruling was required upon.

60233. CHAIRMAN.—There is one point of some difficulty on which you have given us a memorandum. It is a question of uncompleted sales where bargains for the sale of holdings have been entered into within the congested area but not completed, and you foresee difficulty about arranging for them with the Estates Commissioners. Suppose the Estates Commissioners no longer operate in this area and the Board take it entirely in hands, how are these cases which have been negotiated through the medium of the Estates Commissioners to be settled?—My suggestion was that where they did not declare properties, the terms of purchase of which were arranged, to be "estates," the matter was not finally closed, and I thought the simplest way was that the Estates Commissioners should hand over all the originating requests and originating applications in respect of these estates and let the new Board be empowered to deal with them, and decide whether they would certify them to be estates to be sold by direct sale.

60234. Would that create any difficulty among the landlords who had agreed to sell to the Estates Commissioners?—It might A landlord might reasonably object, as he had arranged for the sale knowing the procedure to be followed as regards the completion of the matter, namely, that the sale was to go through the Estates Commissioners, and that now a new body was empowered to review and reject or accept his proposals I think perhaps there is an objection in that way.

60235. Mr. KAVANAGH.—And the Estates Commissioners will have settled with the tenants, too?—In these cases they would not have settled with the tenants if they did not reach the point of their procedure when they declare it to be an estate

60236. Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL.—But the bargain with the landlord as to price would have been complete?—Not completed where it is not declared to be an estate after inspection.

60237. What then would be the landlord's objection that you would anticipate?—It is completed so far as the prices arranged are within the zones, but with regard to the holdings that did not come within the zone conditions, the prices are subject to alteration after inspection. It frequently happens that the Estates Commissioners will say, "We cannot advance quite as much as you have arranged with your tenants for these holdings, and will only give you so much." If they had inspected and had conveyed their decision to the vendor and that he agreed to their terms in the ordinary procedure the property would be declared to be an estate on the adjusted price. The objection the landlord will have is this "Your Board is coming in to review the price proposed for the holdings that are not within the zone conditions; a new body is coming in to review the bargain; I don't think that is fair, and I won't approve of them."

60238. Sir FRANCIS MOWATT.—Why won't it be fair to him?—Because he lodges an agreement on the understanding that the Estates Commissioners only could fulfil that function.

60239. He might think your Board might fix it higher than the Estates Commissioners?—He may or may not think so. It is a new condition introduced which he did not contemplate when arranging the sale

60240. Mr. KAVANAGH.—He has been to all the expense and trouble of stating his case, and the new Board then steps in?

60241. Sir ANTONY MACDONNELL.—The new Board would step in and buy *in globo* all these estates for which agreements have been come to between landlord and tenant?—Yes, *in globo*, if portions of them required treatment.

60242. In any case you would buy *in globo*?—We would not buy an estate that does not require treatment.

60243. You would allow that to pass through, and then you would proceed to differentiate the part that needed treatment and the part that did not. Would not that require an enormous staff, to distinguish, to draw up new agreements, new maps and so on?—No I would not think so.

60244. If you divide an estate which was a single estate, and declare it to be two estates, you will have to prepare a map?—That is a very small matter

60245. I think that will be a very protracted matter and a very expensive matter, and it will require a large establishment for these 30,000 holdings?—No, that is not a matter involving much trouble, because the holdings being in a condition in which they might pass without treatment, the mapping is not difficult

60246. You would have to make out very many maps?—Under the new rules we would oblige every vendor to lodge a map showing the holdings to facilitate us in deciding whether the estate needed treatment or not. At present we only require a vendor to lodge a map showing the boundary of his tenanted land and his untenanted land. He has not to show the separate holdings at all. We would require that now, and consequently the checking or revision of maps for the good portion of the estate would be a small matter.

60247. Most Rev. Dr O'DONNELL.—These difficulties arise with reference to estates in an incomplete condition. I know owners are now anxious to negotiate with the Estates Commissioners, as they anticipate that there may be a change in the arrangements with regard to the bonus in the near future?—They tell me that that is their chief reason for now desiring to sell, and also to get on the list for payment of purchase money Some of the largest owners in Mayo have approached me within the last two months, and asked me if they offered their estates to the Board would the Board purchase, and I had to give them an evasive reply until the last Board meeting, and since then I told those who communicated with me that the Board were debarred from purchasing for the present.

60248. I want Mr. Doran just to state to the Commission whether this factor would not within the next couple of months probably very seriously enlarge the difficulty of dealing with land in an uncompleted condition as regards transfer, from the circumstances that many landlords in the West, fearing that the change in the bonus would not be favourable to their interests, would hurry during these months to try to arrange for a sale to the Estates Commissioners?—I look upon it as a very serious matter, mainly for this reason, that according to the figures prepared by Mr. Callan nearly half the holdings in the counties containing congested districts are either sold or have been offered for sale, so that only rather more than half remains open yet, and I believe that a very large proportion of the owners of the remaining half will within the next three or four months offer their estates to the Estates Commissioners, because they anticipate a change in the conditions of the bonus.

60249. If those agreements went through and were completed a very large number of holdings would be vested in the tenants without being raised to anything like an economic condition?—You would then have to deal with what I have described in a memorandum I have handed in as vested congestion.* A considerable area of the non-economic and intermixed holdings will be vested, and the problem of dealing with vested congestion will be much enlarged.

* See p 45.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

60250. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—That would be the case if the Estates Commissioners did not exercise their functions of relieving congestion, because they exercise these functions on estates which they don't purchase as congested estates?—Would they exercise these functions in respect of estates purchased by direct sale?

60251. They don't exercise their functions I suppose with the particularity that you do, but that they do relieve congestion on estates passing from landlord to tenant is a fact?—Then I think that the field for the Board's future operations would be very much reduced, and it would seem to me likely to alter the whole problem as discussed by the Commission if they are allowed to go on.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—They will be allowed to go on until some change takes place in the law.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—What Mr. Doran suggested was that there ought to be an executive order issued by the Irish Government prohibiting the Estates Commissioners from going on with those estates. I have been thinking over that, and I think it is a matter upon which you ought to have opinion. So far as I have been able to understand it I don't think it is in the power of the Irish Government to issue such an order. Mr. Callan reminds me that it appears from a judicial decision in the Downes-Martin case that such an order would be *ultra vires*.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—What court was that before?

Mr. Callan.—The Estates Commissioners. They offered to state an appeal for the Judicial Commissioner, but an appeal was not taken.

Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—The difficulty is obviously increased from the fact that owners will now hasten to make their bargains with their tenants in view of the rearrangement of the bonus. That is only one side of it. The more serious side is that if the owners of these estates were anxious to sell them to the Congested Districts Board, the Congested Districts Board has been told that it is not in a position to buy them pending the report of this Commission. That is the crux. If the Congested Districts Board were in a position to buy these estates it would not be necessary to issue such an order.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—The Congested Districts Board has been unable to purchase because it had no means at its disposal?

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—Yes; they say, "You shall not purchase any estates with which you have not means to deal." Our income of £86,000 is fixed by legislation. We got the last £20,000 under the Act of 1903.

Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Two or three months ago, with the Chief Secretary in the chair, we agreed to go on purchasing a fair number of tenanted estates on the ground that the expenditure on improvements necessary would not be an immediate thing at all, and that there would be sufficient income in years to come to meet the improvements on these estates.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—At the last meeting, at which your lordship was not present, that was reconsidered. The whole thing was gone into, and it was considered that in view of the distinct orders from the Treasury we ought not to carry out further purchases.

Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—The expenditure on these estates will not come on immediately. You cannot do anything to bring it on until next winter even if you bought them. The arrangement was made that the Congested Districts Board should go on buying these estates now because otherwise they will get very much out of hand. They will be sold through the Estates Commissioners and they will be in an incomplete condition when legislation that we anticipate is passed.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—I think we were rather impressed by this fact, that we should only be in the position of the receivers for the landlords on these estates. If we had not money to purchase these estates the estates would not be vested in us; we should not be the owners and we should not be able to realise the rents otherwise than as the attorneys of the owners.

Sir John Colomb.—Another important matter is that if a vast number of estates pass now because of apprehensions about the bonus on those estates, where there is untenanted land you will have farmers' sons in discharge of the obligation on the Estates Commissioners planted on the land, which will make the position of the Congested Districts Board hopeless.

60252. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—What is your recommendation with reference to estates containing grass lands, in large proportion, in the hands of the Estates Commissioners when the Congested Districts Board comes into authority: you would not like that the grass lands should pass away from the relief of congestion?—What I think is this. If the Estates Commissioners proceed with the purchase now, knowing that a large number of vendors were anxious to sell. I think it is not at all improbable that one-half of the remaining half of the unsold estates will be arranged for before next November. That being so, and purchase agreements being entered into between tenants and landlords which destroy the relations of landlord and tenant, there would be such a small and scattered area free for the new Board to deal with they would have no chance of dealing with congestion in the comprehensive manner discussed by the Commission. I don't think the Board should be continued at all in that event, for I do not believe they could do satisfactory work, and it would be better to allow the Estates Commissioners to complete the small remnant that will be left.

60253. Sir John Colomb.—Unless additional powers were given to the Board to interfere with these people?—It would seem to me if the Estates Commissioners do that you ought to let the Estates Commissioners complete the work, because if they get control of a large portion of what now remains unsold, and binding legal agreements have been entered into with respect to the tenanted and untenanted lands, then the new Congested Districts Board will have to deal with the remaining congestion in very detached areas, and they could not do it satisfactorily, or with any credit to themselves.

60253. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—Why not? The thing would be only in agreements that are deposited with the Estates Commissioners. Now they have to take their turn on the *rota*, with a delay of several years. With the £36,000,000 to be dealt with, there is five years' work for the Estates Commissioners now. If they buy now they will have to wait five years. Where the Estates Commissioners have within the scheduled districts any untenanted land if it were arranged that that land should be held for the purposes of the Congested Districts Board except in so far as it is necessary for relief of congestion on bad estates which they bought, there you have met all the evils which the Bishop refers to?—It won't be practicable. What is happening is this. I will take Lord A——'s estate. He approached me through his agent to know if the Board would buy. I told him ten or twelve days ago that the Board could not buy. His agent then went straight away from the Clanmorris office and arranged terms with the tenants, and the terms are these—all the untenanted land on the estate must be given to tenants or sons of tenants on the estate, and they won't have it otherwise. Other estates where there is untenanted land will be sold only on the same condition—namely, that the tenants will refuse to buy their holdings at all unless with the condition that all the untenanted land on the estate is to be given to them.

60254. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—And their sons?—Yes.

60255. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—That is perfectly easily met. Under the Act of 1903 the owner has a statutory right to come to an agreement with his tenants for the purchase of their holdings, but he has not a statutory right to come to agreements with his tenants as to land not on their holdings: at least he has not such a right as to force it on the Estates Commissioners?—He has not.

60256. If he has not there is ground for an executive instruction to the Estates Commissioners, so that they could do it?—But the tenants feel that they have a very considerable power themselves, perhaps more than the Government think. They say, "that may be the law, but we are going to have the land."

60257. Of course if that is to be regarded as being the rule, there is no use in saying that we are going to keep the land for the relief of congestion if we anticipate we will have to yield to the claims of sons of tenants?—The estates that will be bought at once are the estates with a considerable amount of untenanted land upon them, because these are the estates on which the owners will get near their own price from the tenants when they are prepared to make the condition that all the untenanted land is to pass for their advantage. The situation is as plain as A, B, C.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 24, 1908.

Mr. Henry Doran

60258 Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—If that be so would it be a matter of great urgency that the Congested Districts Board should be enabled now, if it can be done, to go on with the purchase of these estates?—I say deliberately this: if the sales of the estates go on, and the Board are prevented from purchasing, you should abandon the idea of forming a new Congested Districts Board. It would not be able to do effective work and would fail; and it should not be appointed if it does not get a fair chance of succeeding.

Mr. F. W. D. Mitchell.

Mr. F. W. D. Mitchell re-examined.*

60259. Sir Francis Mowatt.—I think you heard Mr. Doran give his evidence as to the increase in cost and numbers of the staff under himself as chief inspector for the land service on the larger scope which the Commission propose to entrust to the Congested Districts Board; but there will no doubt be an addition necessary to the secretarial staff, and we understand you are prepared to give us some evidence about that. Have you prepared a table, as Mr. Doran did?—I have here a general statement comparing the manner in which the income of the Board is now expended, the expenditure under each head at present, and roughly as it may be in the future under some of Mr. Doran's proposals.†

60260. Outdoor staff and expenses—that Mr. Doran has dealt with?—Yes.

60264. Mr. Doran gave us some information about the cost of the outdoor staff, which at present is £9,900, and for which the figure suggested is £32,800. Take your second item, indoor staff and office maintenance, £12,100; proposed, £26,700. Explain to us how the £12,000 is expended and what increase in numbers and salaries you contemplate in giving the increased amount of £26,000?—At present the cost of administration amounts in all for the present year to £36,000, including estates, fisheries, and everything. Out of that the share attributable to the estates business is £24,800, say, £25,000.

60265. Where do we get the £25,000?—It is the proportion of the cost of administration attributable to estates work.

60266. Outdoor staff and expenses in connection with estates work are put down at £9,900, that is to say, £10,000?—Yes. The portion of the office expenditure, the indoor expenditure, which is attributable to estates, is arrived at by a rough estimate.

60267. What was your rough estimate?—£12,100 with the office maintenance.

60268. And the law staff and expenses?—The law staff and expenses are about £4,000 this year. That is a little abnormal on account of the arrears due to Mr. Fottrell, the Board's late solicitor, having been paid this year.

60269. It is greater than it used to be?—Yes. Some of the charges for previous years have been paid this year. The normal amount would be more like £3,000, which I have given separately. Then I have an estimate of the increase which would be required if the estates business were trebled.

60270. The indoor staff and expenses now stand at £12,000?—Yes.

60271. How many clerks are there now in the estates branch?—In the estates branch there are now sixteen, exclusive of the head of the branch.

60272. Are they on different scales of salary or on the same scale?—They are all on different scales. The head of the branch is the only permanent civil servant. He is chief clerk and senior man in the office, next the assistant secretary and myself. His salary at present is £500 a year. His men are all temporary clerks, with salaries varying from 25 shillings a week to £200 a year. One of them has £200 a year. The majority have about 30 shillings a week. There are sixteen of them. Then it is proposed to add sixteen. That is double the staff for treble the work.

60273. When you say treble the work you mean treble the amount of land, but it does not follow that the work would be trebled?—As far as I can see it would be. There is nothing to show that the other estates would be less troublesome than those already treated.

60274. Then the estates which pass without treatment?—They are over and above the purchases of one million a year, on which the expenditure is to be calculated, I believe.

60275. You double the number of that staff—you add sixteen more?—Yes. That is, the estates branch which is entirely occupied with estates work.

60276. Mr. Sutherland.—Do you propose to leave the salaries the same as they are now—the thirty-two?—Yes. I estimate the salary at £100 a year, which would allow for some increments. For the first couple of months they have 25 shillings a week under the Board's regulations, and then if they are found to be efficient their salary is increased to 30 shillings, or £78 a year. It remains at that for three years. Then if they are doing good work and are thoroughly efficient their salary is increased to 35 shillings. After they have been a year at that rate the Board may, if they are still giving approved service, increase their salaries further, gradually.

60277. Sir Francis Mowatt.—To any maximum?—Not to any fixed maximum.

60278. What is the highest a man is receiving?—As a general rule the maximum is about £150, but there are one or two temporary clerks in the office who have been there twelve years or more who go up to £200. But I may say that the clerical staff of the office is paid at a lower rate in the aggregate than any department of the Civil Service in Ireland.

60279. I believe that that is so?—I have the figures.

60280. You need not labour that point. I know that?—The next branch is Collection of Rents. I have treated that in the same way, assuming there would be a corresponding increase in the collection of rents.

60281. Sir John Colomb.—I understood from Mr. Doran that the collection was done by the Land Commission?—After the holdings are sold the Land Commission collect the annuities, but while the estate is in the Board's hands the Board collect the rent.

60282. When a property is acquired by the Congested Districts Board and the people continue under rent you collect the rents?—Yes.

60283. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Mr. Doran was speaking of the outdoor staff?—Yes. In the rent branch there as an officer in charge with a salary of from £300 to £400, and there is a third-class clerk whose salary is £172 a year. There are eleven temporary clerks.

60284. That is there are now thirteen clerks?—Altogether.

60285. You propose to double that?—Yes.

60286. Mr. Sutherland.—You will only have one chief clerk all the same?—Yes.

60287. You will double the eleven?—Yes. Then the accounts branch is very mixed. The work includes other work in addition to the estates. The present staff consists of a book-keeper at from £350 to £400. Two third-class clerks, one with £180 and one with £95, and eleven clerks. I suggest adding twelve men, temporary clerks, to cost £1,200. That is, I propose that their salaries as temporary clerks would, roughly, average £100. Then the correspondence branch and the stores branch would also be considerably increased. The principal part of the work is in connection with estates, which would be increased. The correspondence branch is chiefly employed on estates work; so that the aggregate increase would be £14,600. That is including also the cost of office maintenance, printing, stationary, postage and telegrams.

60288. Sir Francis Mowatt.—I do not know how the figures were arrived at, but they are more than double the present amount?—I am giving you the figures for treble the work. That is the way I work it out. I am asking for £14,600 in addition to £12,100.

60290. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—You ask for £14,600?—Yes, in addition to the £12,100.

60291. Sir Francis Mowatt.—In addition to the £14,600 I should like to know what addition you have proposed to the salaries of the men holding office now, because of the increase of the staff under them?—I have not included that in the £14,600; something must be added for such increments.

* For former examination see Appendix to the First Report of the Commission [Cd. 3267, 1906], p. 22.

† See p. 52.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

60292. This really represents the same rates of salary, but the additional number which you consider necessary for dealing with three times the existing amount of work?—Yes.

60293. The existing amount of work, as I understand it, is about £400,000 a year?—I am treating it, roughly, as a turnover of £330,000 a year; that is one-third of a million.

60294. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—At the same time the staff have been anxious, I suppose, to put their case before the Commission for improved conditions of employment?—The temporary clerks have sent a petition to the Commission, I believe, asking for some change of status. That is, they would like to be placed permanently in the Civil Service and given the right to pensions; and I should perhaps have made some estimate for increase of salary of the heads of branches. If the work is trebled they will have far more men to look after, and if not immediately they would probably after a time naturally expect to have some increase of salary.

60295. Sir Francis Mowatt.—How many officers would you say would come under that category? The greater number there are only doing strictly clerical work. How many men have you alluded to as the heads of offices?—There are five principal heads of branches, and one or two smaller ones. The stores branch consists of three men, for instance. You might say half a dozen.

60296. Now, as to the law officers' expenditure?—I have consulted Mr. O'Connor about that, and he agrees with the estimate I have made about increasing the present cost, which is at least £3,000, up to £6,500.

60297. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—What are the items of the increase?—I have a rough memorandum of the salaries here.

60299. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—You have estimated that the £4,000 would be rather exceptional for this year?—Yes.

60300. What would be the normal corresponding with that?—I think at present if there are no arrears to be paid this year that the normal expenditure would be about £3,000.

60301. Therefore, the expense is not trebled, but it is more than doubled?—Yes.

60302. The normal expenditure is in the proposition not quite trebled?—Yes. I have put on £500 to his estimate. He asks for £6,000 I think.

60303. Sir Francis Mowatt.—What led you to increase it?—I thought it a very doubtful item. It has generally been more than we expected each year, and it would be better to make it a rather liberal estimate.

60304. Well, I daresay there is a point of view from which that is desirable, but there is also the point of view in which one ought not to increase the estimate?—If you add £500 to head number 2 for possible increases of salaries, and take off £500 for the solicitor's branch, it will make the two even.

60305. Then there is the item of interest on borrowed money?—The amount the Board have to pay at present is abnormal. One reason is they have not repaid to the Board of Works nearly £50,000 which was borrowed for the old estates, and therefore they are still paying interest on that, and they are also paying instalments as well as interest this year. We are paying £9,000 at the present moment on the Board's estimate for the current year.

60306. What is this borrowed money?—It is money borrowed with the consent of the Treasury from the Board of Works out of the local loans fund on the security of the Church Surplus Grant.

60307. For what purpose?—For the improvements of estates, and to some small extent for other purposes, such as Raiffeisen banks, agricultural loans, loans to tenants.

60308. And you are comparing that with the probable indebtedness on borrowing three millions?—Yes, I estimate that, but I know from facts and also from Mr. Doran's estimates, that if the Board had three millions worth of land in hands it would be fair to assume that the amount that the Board could borrow from the Board of Works under the present Treasury regulations would be £200,000, that is £200,000 would be the enhanced value recoverable on the three millions worth of land in hands at any one time.

60309. They would be always that amount out of pocket for the moment?—Yes, three millions would be the total value of estates in hands at any time, but the £200,000 is the enhanced value up to which the Board could borrow. Under the Treasury rules it cannot borrow more than it will probably recover out of the expenditure. Therefore, I have not assumed that the Board will borrow more than they will probably recover from the tenants on resale, judging by estates that the Board have already bought under this Act.

60310. But what amount do you assume, under those circumstances they would borrow?—£200,000.

60311. Mr. Sutherland.—What would be the necessity for borrowing any additional sum?—While the estate is in hands the Board have to spend a very large sum on the estate, and they have no fund out of which they can pay the expenditure during the interval between purchase and resale. When they resell they can only recover a small portion of the outlay. They lose the balance.

60312. They lose the interest too that they pay for it?—Yes.

60313. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—If an arrangement could be made by which the Board would be able to draw upon its capital for this purpose it would make a saving, would not it?—In cases of emergency the Board have a statutory right under the Act of 1891 to draw, with the consent of the Treasury, a portion of the Church Surplus Grant of £1,500,000. That would cost in interest 2¾ per cent. When they borrow from the Board of Works it would be 3½.

60314. With the consent of the Treasury there is no legal difficulty?—There is no legal difficulty. It simply depends on the will of the Treasury.

60315. Is not the only difficulty that the capital of the Congested Districts Board is, so to say, used as a guarantee covering the purchase by tenant-purchasers in the Board's area?—Yes. There is a considerable sum now guaranteed.

60316. Sir Antony MacDonnell.—Is not the whole of the sum in the contingent guarantee?—No. It has been taken out of it by the last Act. The only burden on it now is the guarantees that the Board give upon it.

60317. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—It is no longer in the guarantee fund?—No.

60318. Is not it a fact that the guarantee for the tenant-purchasers is not fixed on the capital alone but on the whole income of the Congested Districts Board?—The Board give the guarantee on the security of the Church Surplus Grant.

60319. Is it on all their funds?—It is on all their funds.

60320. Would not it be a useful inquiry whether it could be shown that it would be sound finance from the Treasury point of view to allow some of that million and a half of money to be used as working capital?—A portion of it no doubt available for an emergency like the present would be very useful, but to borrow any large part of it would perhaps be objectionable, because the Board have given it as security.

60321. You think there is an emergency now that will require special provision?—Yes, a very great emergency. If it were known that the Treasury would not advance this £25,000 the Board should immediately wire Mr. Doran to stop all the work on the estates because the Board would be bankrupt at the end of this month.

60322. And you say if the Treasury saw its way there is no legal prohibition to the use of £25,000 out of the original capital of the Board?—The Act states that it is dependent on the will of the Treasury. It can be done with the consent of the Treasury.

60323. Mr. Sutherland.—It practically amounts to this that your expenditure costs you 2¾ per cent. more than it otherwise would if you did not borrow?—The difference between 2¾ and 3½ per cent.

60324. You always borrow money and pay interest for it, and the interest has to be added to the cost of administration?—Yes. It comes out of the Board's income.

60326. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—The money borrowed at present costs the Board 3½ per cent. interest. If it were allowed to use as capital any portion of its endowment then that would cost the Board 2¾ per cent. interest?—Yes.

60327. Mr. Bryce.—The security that has been given has been given over the whole of the fund. Therefore there is a technical difficulty in borrowing any of

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Jan. 24, 1908

Mr. F. W. D. Mitchell.

it?—When the Act said it was dependent on the will of the Treasury they meant, I suppose, that it was to be considered on its merits; that is, that it was to be considered in relation to the amount of charge on it. The amount of charge on it is comparatively small.

60328. Sir Francis Mowatt.—Is not the necessity for Treasury approval merely to enable the Treasury to prevent you from destroying your own security?—Certainly.

60329. As long as you have got a sum of money, big or little, and give it as security for a loan, big or little, every portion of the former sum becomes pledged to the loan, and neither the Treasury nor anybody else can enable you to withdraw any portion of that money except to the damage of your credit; therefore, when it says that it must be subject to the consent of the Treasury it means that the Treasury——?—It meant that the Treasury had the option.

Sir Francis Mowatt.—The Treasury have it fully before them now.

60330. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—I am only anxious to say with reference to Mr. Bryce's point that it seems to be optional with the Treasury under the statute to consider that portion of the capital free which is not required for the purpose of the guarantee. That would allow a discretion?—Yes. Sir Francis appeared to think that if it was given at all as security that would prevent any part of it from being lent; but one section of the Act says with the consent of the Treasury the Board can draw part of the fund, and another section says the Board may borrow from the Board of Works upon the security of this fund. So if it were intended that if the Board borrowed at all under one section they could not employ any portion of the fund under the other——

60331. Sir Francis Mowatt.—This is what the Treasury has power to do, "As may not in the opinion of the Treasury or the Lord Lieutenant be required for the contingent portion of the guarantee fund"?—That is out of it now. That does not apply.

60332. The whole case is now before the Treasury, and without in the least questioning the value of your opinion they will decide it on the law officer's opinion?—Yes, but that is not the only head under which the Treasury could assist the Board. They could give them a loan from the Board of Works.

60333. That I believe the Treasury is considering. There is some doubt about it. For that reason, I think, we should be taking up your time uselessly if we argued it. What is £50,000 floating capital, the next item?—Mr. Doran mentions in that memorandum which he read to you the day before yesterday that there would be in future, as there have been in the past, no doubt, delays in recovering the proceeds of estates on re-sale. There always has been more delay than has been expected, and the Board would require some floating capital to tide them over the interval.

60334. But I see at present they want none?—There is no floating capital now except what the Board can find out of their own funds. They have hitherto been saving, that is by investing money in estates and getting it back gradually they had accumulated a certain amount of floating capital, but it has been insufficient, and at the end of the present year the Board will be about £40,000 to the bad.

60335. This £1,750 represents 3½ per cent. on £50,000?—Yes. Such a loan may not be necessary for this reason. It occurred to me that if Parliament gave the Board a very much larger income, such as could not be all expended the first year, the savings of it during the first year would provide a floating capital.

60336. Mr. Sutherland.—Have you to surrender the savings now?—No.

60337. Is not that a fund for you to have a floating capital?—There is a deficiency at present. There is no surplus.

60338. Don't you contemplate you may have a surplus something like other departments?—No. The Board's work has been increasing too fast for their means.

60339. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—You say there might be a surplus the first year?—Yes, if the Government gave the Board a liberal grant during the first year the machinery would not be in order for spending it all.

60340. Mr. Sutherland.—My point is this: under your Act you are not obliged to surrender any surplus?—No.

60341. Have not you got the nucleus of your fund for floating capital?—No; the Board has not been able to save spare capital. It has not been able to pay its way.

60342. Have you never had a surplus?—The Board have had a surplus every year on their estimates. They never exceed their income, but in order to prevent a deficit at the end of the year they have several times stopped Mr. Doran's work and delayed the work on portions of the estates.

60343. Look over the estimates of almost every department of the public service and you will see that one year with another there is a large surplus which they have to surrender to the Treasury?—The Board is not like other public departments in which the surplus would be surrendered to the Government. The fund is entrusted to the Board to be expended at its discretion.

60344. But you have to make a balance every year and submit it to the Treasury?—That is for the formal sanction of the Treasury.

60345. Sir Francis Mowatt.—The loss on estates, you say, is now £11,000—it jumps up to £125,000, what percentage are you counting at?—Mr. Doran wanted £150,000, as you are aware, for the loss on a million, but I have had to reduce that by making the adjustment which would follow from his proposal that the cost of clerks of works and surveyors instead of being charged to administration should come out of the Board's income. It would come under the head of administration and not that of loss on estates, so I have taken off roughly what that would amount to from the £150,000.

60346. What does that £125,000 represent in the way of percentage?—It is 12½ per cent.

60347. Sir John Colomb.—That does not agree with the prospective loss estimated by Mr. Doran; you put it at 12½?—Yes, but you have to make an adjustment for the clerks of works and cost of surveyors.

60348. You start with Mr. Doran's figure of 17 per cent.?—No, I start with 15 per cent.

60349. You start with 2 per cent. less than Mr. Doran before you begin your reductions?—It comes down to 15.

Chairman.—Mr. Doran said 15 per cent.

Mr. Kavanagh.—15 on the enlarged area.

60356. We are dealing only with the land part of the expenditure now. Therefore perhaps you would tell us on what grounds you raise the expenditure on Parish Committees from £12,000 to £20,000?—It is a suggestion that has been made that the Congested Districts Board would like to increase the Parish Committees from £12,000 to £20,000.

60357. Sir John Colomb.—Do you mean an increase in the number, or in the grants, or both?—Both.

60358. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—It arises in this way, that in a county like Leitrim they are complaining they have not Parish Committees all over the county; also in a county like Kerry, even if you look only at the area which has been scheduled. Does not it occur to you that if the area is enlarged there will be some parishes at all events in which the new Board may establish Parish Committees?—It did occur to me, and I thought yesterday when I heard of the proposal to schedule Connaught that the Board would be besieged with applications from twice as many parishes as now get grants, and they would have to refuse to listen to most of these applications.

60359. Sir Francis Mowatt.—But of course that is an estimate or proposal for increased work. You have no figures which would enable you to test the 12 against the 20, except that that is the additional amount which the Board propose to ask for?—Yes. I should explain I have no authority whatever for my estimate, except that I wish to endeavour to give the Commission the means of judging how Mr. Doran's proposals would work in with the income.

60364. Chairman.—You have not made any allowance for agricultural development, of course?—No. These figures from item No. 7 downwards,* as I have stated, are a very rough guess of my own so as to suggest an inquiry as to what income would cover the expenditure.

60365. Mr. Bryce.—You made no provision for industrial development?—Very little, but I have added 50 per cent.; but that is a mere guess.

60366. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—If the area is so much enlarged it would require a great deal?—Yes. We had no means of arriving at any definite figures.

* See p. 52.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

60367. You are aware that in parts of the area from which we took evidence the people alluded to Foxford, and said that the Board should try something of that kind in their districts?—Yes.

60368. But without funds that could not be done, of course?—No. When the Board assisted Foxford so liberally they had a great deal of ready money. There was £50,000, which formed part of the old fishery funds, that was drawn from those funds with the consent of the Treasury, and we also had savings of income The work had not overtaken the income, as it did very shortly afterwards.

60369. After that it would have been difficult for the Congested Districts Board to encourage any such project?—They have never had the means.

60370. Are not you aware that the Department of Agriculture has been complaining that the small sum handed over to them by the Congested Districts Board in the year did not enable them to do the amount of agricultural work in the districts that they desire?—Yes, I understood that when they took over from the Board for £2,000 work which had cost the Board £11,000, it was a bargain that they would do that work, but directly after it was taken over they complained that the money was insufficient.

60371. You thought it was understood that there would not be much diminution in the work?—Yes, I thought that was understood; that they were very anxious to get the work and would do it for £2,000.

60372. Mr. Bryce.—You mean do for £2,000 all that the Board did?—No; they intended to make up the deficiency.

60373 That they would spend on this work £9,000 more than they got?—Yes.

60374 They did not promise that absolutely?—If the Board were under the impression that the work which they had been carrying on at a cost of £11,000 was to be practically extinguished by being reduced to £2,000 they would never have consented.

60375. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—But latterly the Department has been expending a great deal more than that sum in these areas?—Yes. I believe that they are expending up to £10,000

60376. You are aware that they expect that for the purpose of relieving congestion a good deal of that money should be provided?—Of course it is a fact that their income did not include money for the congested districts, and Parliament should have given them a further grant

60377. Mr. Kavanagh —Their income was based on the assumption that they would not have the congested districts?—Yes.

60378. They were actually excluded from them?—Yes, but they accepted a transfer of the work before they got the income from Parliament. That is really the position.

60379. Mr. Sutherland.—Does not there seem a disproportion between the amount spent on general industries and fishing?—Do you think that £3,000 is an adequate expenditure on the fisheries of Ireland?—Taking last year, which was normal, the gross expenditure on fishing was £40,000, that is for expenditure direct and indirect for the benefit of fisheries—for instruction in fishery, providing piers, new boats, and making loans. They recovered £26,000 out of the £40,000. Therefore the net expenditure, direct and indirect, is £14,000.

60380. Most Rev. Dr. O'Donnell.—Don't you think we have had sufficient indication at the Congested Districts Board that in developing the fisheries a much bigger sum than you have contemplated would be required annually?—I think that more piers are required at a good many places around the coast. The Board have always had a large number of cases of marine works that have been asked for and inquired into, but which they are unable to execute.

60381. Would not you want officers, practical fishermen, who will have the confidence of the people and know their business, stationed at various parts of the coast?—There should be more officers, and the Board ought to spend more on piers, and perhaps more on boats. The money available for new boats has been too limited.

60382. Sir John Colomb.—In some cases the Board gave bounties in some form or another for accelerating communication?—For steamer services the Board are now paying £3,900.

60383. Does the steamer service include subsidies for means of communication and the maintenance of the *Granuaile*?—Yes. There are only two subsidies at present.

60384. Do you leave that at the same figure, although you are going to deal with a very much larger area?—Yes, the Board have withdrawn their subsidies and I have heard of no intention of renewing them. Of course if the Board had means very likely they would do so.

60385. The £3,900 includes the cost of the Granuaile, and all such subsidies?—Yes. The net cost of the Granuaile is £3,000 and there is an additional £900, which makes up a total of £3,900 at present.

60386. You took it as settled that the Board were not going to subsidise any more?—I had no reason to suppose that the Board would revive subsidies which have ceased. I am sorry to say that these figures, as you understand, were made up rather hastily. I had to wait until Mr. Doran's programme was out, and then I had to do it in haste.

The Commission adjourned

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

INDEX TO APPENDICES.

Page

Appendix I.—Documents put in by Mr. H. Doran.

A. Notes of Evidence, ... 42

B. Memorandum on Vested Congestion, ... 45

C. Notes on Maintenance of Improvements, ... 45

D. Table showing Loss on Estates, ... 46

E. Table showing Tenancy Interests acquired by the Congested Districts Board, . 47

F. Return of Non-residential Holdings over £25 Poor Law Valuation, . . . 48

Appendix II.—Statement put in by the Secretary, Irish Land Commission.

Return showing since 1869, the Number and Amount of Advances made (and Applications pending), to enable Tenants and Others to Purchase Holdings or Parcels of Land, ... 50

Appendix III.—Documents put in by Mr. F. W. D. Mitchell.

A. Table showing Appropriation of Board's Income, ... 52

B. Tables showing Expenditure on Schemes undertaken by the Board, . . . 53

Appendix IV.—Documents and Statistics put in by the Secretary of the Commission.

A. Memorandum and Statistics relating to Crops grown and Cattle carried on different classes of Holdings, with Summaries as regards Holdings under and over 50 acres, and under 30 acres, between 30 and 200 acres, and over 200 acres, ... 55

B. Tables showing Total Number of Agricultural Holdings in certain Counties of Ireland, in 1841 and subsequent years, ... 88

C. Memorandum on Relief of Distress, ... 91

D. Table showing for Ten Years, 1891–1901, the Number, in Ireland, of Marriages, Births, Deaths, the Excess of Births over Deaths, Decrease in Population, and the Emigration, ... 98

E. Statistics as to the Number, Valuation, Acreage, and Population of Holdings in those Districts which are Scheduled as Congested—

(i.) Table showing Total Number of Holdings, and Number of each of Eleven Classes, 100

(ii.) Table showing Area occupied by each Class of Holdings, . . . 100

(iii.) Table showing total Valuation of each class of holding, ... 101

(iv.) Table showing total Population on each class of holding, . . . 101

F. Similar Statistics (as those in E) for the whole of Donegal, Connaught, Kerry, Clare, and Four Unions in County Cork—

(i.) Table showing Total Number of Holdings, and Number of each of Eleven Classes, 102

(ii.) Table showing Area occupied by each Class of Holdings, . . . 102

(iii.) Table showing total Valuation of each class of holding, ... 103

(iv.) Table showing total Population on each class of holding, ... 103

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

INDEX TO APPENDICES—*continued.*

Page

Appendix IV.—Documents put in by the Secretary of the Commission—*continued.*

G. Returns showing Number and Valuation of certain Holdings (*a*) not exceeding £10 Valuation, and the Valuation of Land required to bring Small Holdings up to a uniform Rateable Valuation of £10, and (*b*) over £100 Rateable Valuation, . 104

H. Tables showing for certain Maritime Counties of Ireland the Number of Fishermen who are engaged in other pursuits besides that of Fishing, . . . 105

I. Rulings of Mr. Commissioner O'Brien on the Dillon Estate, ... 106

J. Correspondence with the Secretary of the Congested Districts Board for Scotland, . 107

K. Report of Conference between Board of National Education and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction as to School Gardens, . . . 110

L. Statistics as to Expenditure on Labourers' Cottages, ... 111

Appendix V.—Correspondence between the Congested Districts Board and the Irish Government, ... 112

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX I.

APPENDIX I.

DOCUMENTS PUT IN BY MR. DORAN IN CONNECTION WITH THE EVIDENCE GIVEN BY HIM BEFORE THE COMMISSION.

A.—NOTES OF EVIDENCE.

Mr. Callan having informed me that the Commission desired to obtain some further evidence from me as to the probable loss that would be incurred in dealing with estates which needed treatment in the counties containing Congested Districts, I have prepared particulars of the actual loss incurred by the Board in the treatment of estates purchased under the Irish Land Act, 1903, and which since then have either been sold or are now ready for sale. They are classified as follows:—

Class A.—Poor tenanted estates on some of which there was a certain proportion of untenanted agricultural land available for migration and the enlargement of small holdings.

Class B.—Very poor tenanted estates on which there was practically no agricultural land available for migration and enlargement of holdings, and upon which the improvements effected were mainly re-arrangement of the holdings, improvement of buildings, road-making, and drainage.

Class C.—Migration estates comprised wholly or mainly of untenanted land used chiefly for migration.

The total purchase price of estates A, B, and C is £317,639, and the total amount spent in improvement works is £81,249, and the total net loss £41,152. The total poor law valuation is £12,457, and the total area is 53,627 acres, of which 10,558 acres were untenanted, and 43,069 acres were tenanted. Of the untenanted land about one-half is turbary, bog, mountain, and waste, having a poor law valuation of about one shilling an acre.

Class A comprises 76·1 per cent. of gross purchase money.

Class B comprises 15·6 per cent. of gross purchase money.

Class C comprises 8·3 per cent. of gross purchase money.

The percentage of loss in the treatment of the estates was as follows:—

Class A,	9·4
Class B,	21·6
Class C,	28·8

and the average loss on A, B, and C together was 12·9 per cent.

As already stated, the estates A and B comprise 91·7 per cent. of the gross cost price, and the untenanted land, Class C, was only 8·3 per cent. of the gross. The value of the untenanted land in A, B, C, including turbary, bog, and mountain, is about 28 per cent. of the entire; but, as will be seen on reference to the summary of A, B, C, this amount of untenanted land was altogether insufficient to bring the holdings to an average of £10 rateable value, as there are 1,770 holdings on the estates, the gross rateable value of which is £12,457.

If, as recommended in my evidence, the estates dealt with each year by the Board should comprise two-thirds tenanted and one-third untenanted land, the loss if calculated for one-third untenanted in the same proportion as it has actually been on the 8·3 per cent. on the gross, would make the loss on the entire group of estates, comprising two-thirds tenanted and one-third untenanted, work out at about 14 per cent., but if all the holdings were to be raised to even an average rateable value of £10 much more untenanted land should be provided, and the loss would then exceed 18 per cent.

I consider that these figures based on actual facts afford the best available guide to what the minimum loss might be in dealing in a similar manner with estates needing treatment in the counties containing congested districts.

I may observe that the tenants of the estates in these groups all paid at least two years' full rent, and that the untenanted land was sold at the average price at which all the untenanted land purchased by the Board cost, namely—twenty-seven years' purchase of the estimated fair annual value, consequently in making an estimate of the average loss in future transactions on the basis indicated by these figures, *i.e.*, 14 per cent., it is very important to bear in mind that if the untenanted lands are not purchased at the prices at which they can be sold at on an average a further loss will be entailed in excess of the 14 per cent.

Most of the holdings on the estates in Class A have not been enlarged to any appreciable extent, and, on sale, were largely composed of uneconomic holdings, 74 per cent. of them being under £10 rateable value. The chief improvements effected through the loss of 9·4 per cent., being the re-arrangement of scattered or rundale holdings, improvement of dwellings, construction of drains, fences and roads. Although these estates have been appreciably benefited by the Board's treatment, the results cannot be considered satisfactory while a large proportion of the holdings disposed of were uneconomic.

Class B comprised poorer estates than those in Class A. A larger number of the holdings needed re-arrangement, and where, as a rule, owing to the poor character of the land, the works carried out in connection with re-arrangement, drainage, and road-making were not considered to be sufficiently directly reproductive to charge any appreciable portion of the outlay to the sale prices of the holdings, consequently a large percentage of loss has occurred with results that are even less satisfactory than in case of the holdings comprised in Class A. Eighty-three per cent. of the holdings sold were under £10 rateable value.

The estates included in Classes A and B may be taken as fair types of poor estates in congested districts, but it will be observed that the proportion of Class B, which comprises very poor estates, is small compared with Class A.

The estates in Class C are almost entirely untenanted estates used for migration, and form only 8·3 per cent of the gross value.

In considering the suggestion to fix a percentage of loss which the Board may incur in dealing with the year's output of estates, it is of importance to study the proportions which the values of Classes A, B, and C respectively bear to the gross value of the three classes grouped together, for it is manifest that if the Board are limited to an average percentage of loss in the year's output, they must arrange to group for treatment the Classes A, B, and C in such proportions as will bring out the average percentage of loss allowed.

To illustrate this, if they confined themselves during the year to dealing with estates Class A, these would involve an average loss of 9·4 per cent. If, on the other hand, they deal only with the poorest estates, Class B, the loss will be 21·6 per cent.; and, if they confine themselves solely to migration, the loss would be at least 30 per cent.; so that, in fixing the average net loss to be incurred on estates dealt with in the year, it would always be necessary to so arrange the proportions of the different classes sold each year as would bring out the average loss at the percentage allowed. I have endeavoured to do this as far as possible with the limited opportunities for grouping the estates that the small extent of purchases by the Board hitherto afforded.

An examination of the past records of the Board's work, as well as a reference to the estates now classed under B, make it clear that the poor and less resourceful estates cannot be dealt with with a less loss than 20 per cent. of the cost price. On a few of these estates the loss even exceeded 100 per cent of the cost price.

It may be taken for certain that extensive migration of small landholders cannot be safely carried out at a less loss than 30 per cent. of the cost price of the land, and this on the assumption that the land *can be sold to migrants* at the price paid for it.

The average price paid by the Board for all untenanted land acquired was, as given in my evidence, 27 years' purchase of an estimated fair rent, the

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

annuity on which would be equivalent to 12½ per cent. reduction in the rent. In my opinion, the annuity of a migrant's holding ought not at the outside exceed 85 per cent. of the estimated fair letting value of the holding, including buildings, and even this rate seems rather too small a margin of security for the payment of the annuity for such a long period as 68½ years, and I would much prefer if it was possible to finance it, so that the annuity of the holding should not exceed 85 per cent. of the fair rent of the land, excluding the buildings. It would be quite possible to do this if migrants could be found who would surrender fairly substantial holdings, for the occupation interest in the holdings they surrender would in all cases be deducted from the cost price of the land in the new holding; but in the case of small holdings this occupation interest is not sufficient to cover the sum added to the value of the land in respect of the necessary buildings erected upon it. So that if the Board continue to acquire untenanted land at twenty-seven years' purchase of an estimated fair rent, and if the migrants to these lands are persons who surrender very small holdings, it will not be possible to let them have the new holdings at an annuity representing 85 per cent. of the fair rent of the land alone without incurring a larger loss than 30 per cent.

I should also point out that it appears probable that the Board will seek to acquire a much larger proportion of non-residential tenanted holdings than they have hitherto acquired, and if they are obliged to pay more for such holdings than for land in the owner's possession they will be unable to sell the new holdings created out of such land at annuities which do not exceed 85 per cent. of the fair rent without incurring a much larger loss than 30 per cent. on the cost price of the land alone of the migrants' holdings. Personally I see no reason why a larger price should be paid for land jointly owned by two persons (tenant and landlord) than if it was occupied by only one of these persons.

I submit a list showing the prices paid by the Board for a number of tenanted holdings which they acquired, classified as follows —

First Term Tenants—Acquired by voluntary agreement without initiation of any legal proceedings.

First Term Tenants—Acquired by pre-emption proceedings.

First Term Tenants—Acquired by resumption proceedings.

Second Term Tenants—Acquired by voluntary agreement without initiation of any legal proceedings.

Second Term Tenants—Acquired by pre-emption proceedings.

Second Term Tenants—Acquired by resumption proceedings.

Future Tenancies—Acquired by Notices to Quit.

In some of these cases the Board acquired the land by voluntary agreement without initiating any legal proceedings. In other cases on receipt of notice from tenants of their intention to sell at a price named, the Board serve notice to pre-empt, and in several cases were advised to pay the excessive prices offered, when after making inquiries they were satisfied that the intending purchaser was a *bona-fide* one and desired to carry out the bargain. The Board served notices to resume possession of several holdings, and the prices paid were in most cases settled by agreement before the hearing of the case by the Land Commission. In a few cases the prices were fixed by the Land Commission after hearing all parties. In many cases notices to quit were served to determine future tenancies, and the prices paid were in accordance with the scale laid down by the Act.

In proof that migration cannot be safely carried out at a less loss than 30 per cent., I submit the following particulars —

£15 holding at 27 years' purchase, .	£405
Cost of buildings, . . .	130
Roads, ...	20
Fences, ...	20
Total cost of holding, ...	£575
Sale price of holding if the annuity be £12 15s. 0*d*, that is 85 per cent. of the annual value of the land alone, .	£393
Loss, ...	£181, less by the occupation interest of the surrendered holding.

1. If the occupation interest of the surrendered holding were only £35 (which was the average value of the occupation interest of the first 207 migrants dealt with) the loss would be £146 per holding, equal to 36 per cent. of the cost price of the land alone. This loss, in the case of the 207 migrants referred to, would have been 37·3 if the buildings had cost £130, and the roads and fences £40, but in these cases the average expenditure per holding on the buildings was £108, fences £20, and the roads and other improvements, £16—that is an expenditure per holding of £26 less than the amount given above.

The fee-simple of the land in the 207 migrants' holdings referred to in the Fourteenth Annual Report (page 121) cost £66,452, which would be an average cost of £321 for the land. The migrants dealt with in the succeeding year, as given in the Fifteenth Report (page 132), involved a loss of £87 per holding (page 13).

2. If the occupation interest of the surrendered holding were £50, the loss would be £181 less £50, equal to £131, or 32 3 per cent. loss on the cost price of the land (£405).

3. If the occupation interest of the surrendered holding were £85, the loss would be £181, less by £85, equal to £96, or 23 7 per cent. loss on the cost price of the land alone (£405).

If the migrant's annuity was to be kept at 85 per cent. of the fair rent of the new holding, including buildings, I would say a fair rent for such buildings as we erect on a £15 holding would be £2, making the gross fair rent £17 (which, multiplied by 26¼, would leave the gross price of the holding £446, and the annuity of this would be £14 10*s*.). Fifteen per cent. off the gross rent of £17 would leave £14 9*s*., which would repay an advance of £445, and the loss in the cases cited would be reduced to the following —

For case 1, the loss would be £94, equal to 23·2 per cent. on the cost price of the land alone (£405).

For case 2, the loss would be £79, equal to 19 5 per cent. on the cost price of the land alone.

For case 3, the loss would be £44, equal to 10 0 per cent. on the cost price of the land alone.

If the annual grant to be made to the Board for the improvement of estates is to be based on an average net loss, it will be necessary to leave the Board free to exercise reasonable discretion in the selection and grouping together for each year, of estates that will involve a large loss, a small loss, and an intermediate loss, and it will rest with the Board to exclude from purchase estates or portions of estates which they consider may be sold without special treatment.

Take the percentage of loss incurred in the treatment of the estates purchased and prepared for sale under the Act of 1903, which may be stated in round figures as —

9 per cent. loss on A.—Tenanted estates which comprised 76 per cent. of the entire value of all the estates dealt with.

20 per cent. on B.—Tenanted estates which comprised 15½ per cent. of all the estates dealt with.

30 per cent. on C.—Untenanted lands which comprised 8½ per cent. of all the estates dealt with.

If the Board dealt with one-third of a million worth of untenanted (C) lands, it would be 30 per cent. of a loss on £333,333, equal, . .	£100,000
If ten per cent. of the tenanted lands were B Class necessitating a loss of 20 per cent., that is 20 per cent. on £100,000, .	£20,000
Total, . . .	£120,000

so that if the average loss permitted on one million's worth of property 33 per cent. of C. and 10 per cent. would make up £120,000, and 57 per cent of the tenanted estates should be dealt with without loss.

It will, I think, be admitted that the class of estates most in need of attention are the poorest tenanted estates, and the untenanted land, and the loss on those would be at least 20 per cent. and 30 per cent respectively, while it would not be possible for the Board to pass through their hands such a large proportion as 57 per cent of the estates dealt with each year without incurring a loss. For these reasons with others I consider that *at least* 15 *per cent.* should be allowed on each million's worth of land dealt with, and for the purposes of an estimate the

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX I.

proposed fifteen per cent. loss might be apportioned as follows.—

33% of C. = £333,333 @ 30 per cent. loss,		£100,000
10% of B. = £100,000 @ 20 per cent. loss,		£20,000
57% of A = £566,667 @ 5·3 per cent. loss,		£30,000
	£1,000,000	£150,000

It is doubtful that it will be possible to deal with 57 per cent. of estates at the small loss of 5·3 per cent, but it is certain that classes B and C cannot be satisfactorily dealt with for a less loss than 20 and 30 per cent. respectively.

In practice it will not be possible for the Board to preserve the above proportions of A, B, and C estates. They may have in any year a smaller proportion of untenanted land and a larger proportion of bad estates that they should deal with. Having regard to these difficulties, I have come to the conclusion that the proposal to fix the grant to be given to the Board at a percentage of the value of estates sold each year is objectionable, and that it would be preferable to have an annual grant placed at the Board's disposal to be applied at the Board's discretion to meet the loss incurred in the treatment of estates purchased by them subject to the general understanding that they would sell each year aboout one million's worth of estates. The Board must be trusted to exercise discrimination in the selection of estates for purchase, and to avoid the purchase of any estates that they are not justified in buying; for if they do not do this and that their output be confined to estates worth one million a year, the length of time which would be required to deal with all unsold properties in the counties containing congested districts would be very long. I anticipate that there will be very great dissatisfaction at the delay necessarily incured in the transfer of the ownership of holdings on poor estates in the counties containing congested districts when the output is confined to one million a year, and it occurs to me that legislation should provide for dealing, if necessary, with a larger output of estates needing treatment when and if the owners willing to sell and the tenants willing to buy are in excess of the million a year.

The untenanted lands dealt with were sold at the prices paid for them The tenanted estates paid at least two years' full rent, and some of them three. It is hardly necessary to point out that a similar class of estates cannot be similarly dealt with at the same loss if the untenanted land is not purchased at a price at which it can be sold, or if the revenue from the lands while on hands be substantially reduced. I may, however, point out that the loss on the estates purchased under the Act of 1903 include cost of surveyors, paymasters, and clerks of works, which ought properly be charged to administration, and is in future to be so charged. I am informed that the Estates Commissioners do not charge to any estate the cost of surveying, valuing, management, or engineering expenses In fact none of the expenses incidental to the supervision of the improvement of estates except the wages of gangers who superintend the workmen.

The cost of valuing the untenanted land purchased by the Board has not been charged to the estates, as all this work was done by me and two valuers on the permanent staff.

If the entire of the counties containing congested districts be placed under the control of the Board, and that compulsory powers be given to acquire, as recommended in my evidence, non-residential holdings, and portions of residential holdings exceeding a specified valuation; and also tenanted estates for the purchase of which terms could not be voluntarily arranged, I think it of the greatest importance that in the case of untenanted land, and lands not held under judicial rents, it should be the duty of the rent-fixing department of the Land Commission, at the request of the Board, to assess on such lands a rent equivalent to a second term rent for a sitting tenant.

As the purchase and sale prices of tenanted lands are now usually arranged on the basis of second term judicial rents fixed by the Land Commission, it seems very advisable that the same body should assess the estimated fair rent of untenanted land sought to be purchased by the Board, as it is upon that standard of value the land must be subsequently disposed of. For the same reason it appears advisable that in the case of holdings on tenanted estates which are subject to non-judicial rents, that the rent-fixing body of the Land Commission should value these holdings so as to furnish the Board with an estimate of a second term rent or its equivalent.

The same procedure might be followed in making the valuation as at present under Form 49, Act 1896, when the landlord and tenant serve upon the Land Commission a joint application to have a fair rent fixed. In pursuance of this procedure in the case of tenanted holdings a representative of the tenant and landlord would both accompany the Sub-Commissioners over the holdings, who would subsequently furnish what is known as the "Pink Schedule," giving the gross estimate of a fair rent, with such deduction therefrom (if any) in respect of improvement effected upon the tenanted holding which the landlord's representative admitted. If there were improvements of substantial value claimed by a tenant and not admitted by the landlord's representative, they should be set out in a separate schedule. In the case of untenanted land there would, of course, be no deduction in respect of improvements, as the land was in the sole occupation of the landlord.

With a view to securing uniformity of price, it is suggested that the most experienced of the staff of the rent-fixing department of the Land Commission be nominated for this particular work of the valuation of land sought to be acquired both by the Congested Districts Board and by the Estates Commissioners These men should be engaged for at least three months of each year in fixing judicial rents so as to keep them in close touch with the actual rent fixation.

In the case of untenanted land, I suggest that it should be made the duty of the Land Commission on the requisition of the Board in manner to be prescribed, to cause a detailed valuation to be made of land sought to be acquired equivalent to second term rent for a sitting tenant. At the same time the Board would request the vendors to furnish particulars of his net income, with proofs of the figures supplied, in the form of regularly-kept books or production of contracts of temporary lettings The Board, having subsequently before them for their consideration the equivalent of a second term fair rent as furnished by the Land Commission (which must be taken as the basis for the disposal of the land), and also particulars of the net income derived from the land by the owner for a specified period, would make an offer to the owner. If the vendor and the Congested Districts Board failed to come to terms, the Board would, if they so desired, serve a notice upon the owner and also upon the Land Commission requiring the latter to fix the price which the Board would pay for the land. This procedure is similar to that now in force under which the Board may serve a tenant on their estate, holding under a judicial tenancy, with notice to resume possession at such price as the Land Commission may fix after hearing the evidence of both parties.

As the Land Commission is the statutory body appointed for the fixing of rents, and as a second term rent is now accepted both by tenant and landlord as the standard of annual value in fixing the number of years' purchase to be paid, I maintain that the rent-fixing department of the Land Commission is the proper body to assess the equivalent of a fair rent.

It is obvious, I submit, that no valuers except those included in the statutory rent fixing body, and actually engaged at the fixing of rents, are capable of authoritatively fixing a judicial rent, or stating its equivalent Whether it is too high or too low a rent it is the statutory rent, fixed in the same manner as the bulk of the second term rents accepted throughout the country as the standard for basing the purchase prices of holdings. Even though unofficial valuers should happen to fix substantially the same rents, their valuation would not have the same authority, as their assessment of a fair rent has necessarily to be based on what their individual conception is of the rent which would be fixed on a particular holding or area of land by the statutory body.

I can see no reason why this important public duty when discharged by the Land Commission should be charged to the Board's expenses no more than the services of the Land Commissioners would be charged when they are called upon by the Board at present to exercise their functions of fixing fair rents on the Board's estates, or fixing the resumption price to be paid for holdings which the Board seek to take up under Section 83 of the Act of 1903. The Board have power to obtain the statutory decision of the Sub-Commissioners in relation to these

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

matters under the existing law without defraying any of the expenses. For the same reason I submit that it should be made a part of the duty of the Land Commission to assess a fair rent or its equivalent on all lands which the Board may request them to fix the rent upon by the service of notice such as is now served when the Land Commission is required to fix a fair rent on any holding held under a present tenancy.

H. DORAN.

B.—MEMORANDUM ON "VESTED CONGESTION."

According to the figures given by Mr. Callan,* about half the holdings in the counties containing congested districts have been either sold, or agreements for sale have been lodged with the Land Commission in respect of them.

It appears to be generally admitted that a considerable number of the holdings already sold are uneconomic, that many of them require re-arrangement and consolidation, and that a number are non-residential holdings which might have been utilized for the enlargement of adjacent small residential holdings.

In view of these facts it will be necessary to give the Board power to apply their remedial measures for the relief of congestion over the entire of the counties placed under their control, irrespective of whether the holdings are occupied by tenant-purchasers, ordinary tenants, leaseholders, or the owners in fee.

When over one-half in number of the tenant-purchasers occupying holdings under £10 rateable value in any townland apply to the Board to re-arrange, improve, or, where possible, enlarge their holdings by the addition of adjacent lands which the Board may be empowered to acquire, the Board may group such holdings and declare them to be an estate of "vested congestion," redeem the purchase annuities, and deal with it as they would with any estate purchased from the landlord.

On the declaration by the Board of any such estate comprising "vested congestion" they shall redeem the outstanding balances of the advances made in respect of each holding, and the relation of tenant and landlord shall be established with all the incidents of judicial holdings between the Board and the occupiers at abated rents equal to their annuities, pending re-sale of the improved or altered holdings, and subject to the condition that on re-sale the price to be charged for that proportion of the new holding which represents the value of the old holding shall be the outstanding balance of the advance in respect of the old holding.

Any additional land in excess of the value of the old holding given in the new holding shall be sold at such price as the occupier of the new holding and the Board may agree, and any advances for buildings or such other improvements as may first be arranged between the occupier and the Board, and provided for in a written agreement, may be added to the sale price of the new or re-arranged holding. In the absence of such agreement, the new or re-arranged holding of equivalent value to the old must be re-vested subject to the same annuity as before.

H. DORAN.

C.—MEMORANDUM ON MAINTENANCE OF ARTERIAL AND MAIN DRAINS, AND OF ACCOMMODATION ROADS CONSTRUCTED BY THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.

Drains.

In the absence of a Public Works Department to undertake the general management and control of arterial and main drainage schemes for the entire of Ireland, as suggested in my evidence before the Arterial Drainage Commissioners, Ireland, 1905, I submit the following suggestions for the maintenance of drains constructed by the Congested Districts Board

The Board shall prepare a map, with schedule, showing the holdings or portions of holdings improved by their drainage operations. The area so improved in each catchment area to be coloured blue on map, and defined as the drainage district liable to assessment for the maintenance of the drainage system within the catchment area. On schedules accompanying the maps shall be given the name of the rated occupier of each holding, the area improved in each holding by drainage, and also the proportion in which the occupier is to contribute to the cost of maintenance.

The maps, with schedule, for each drainage district are to be deposited with the secretary of the County Council, or County Councils, for the county in which the drainage district is situate, and the County Council shall direct their county surveyor to undertake the duty of providing that the drainage system shall be maintained in an efficient condition.

He shall prepare every year specifications of the work required to be done, and the District Council should invite tenders for the execution of the work in such sections as they may decide. Tenders to be dealt with by them in the same manner as tenders for the maintenance of roads, and the amount required to meet the cost shall be assessed on the lands within the drainage district, and collected with the poor rate in the same manner as assessments now are for malicious injuries or separate charges. The persons liable for the assessment may, by arrangement amongst themselves, nominate one or more of their body to contract to carry out the work for a nominal sum, or for any sum not exceeding the amount estimated by the county surveyor

Accommodation Roads.

Accommodation roads are usually of two classes.—

(*a*) A road made from a public road to a village or townland for the sole accommodation of the landholders in the townland or townlands through which the road passes.

(*b*.) Road to a bog which may accommodate a number of persons living on and occupying holdings one or more miles distant, but having turbary on the bog, and requiring the road for access thereto.

(*a*.) In these cases the Board shall lodge with the secretary of the County Council a map, showing the road to be maintained and the holdings of the rated occupiers who use the road.

The County Council shall accept a transfer, free of charge, of the road and make it county property, and instruct the county surveyor to place it on the list of roads for permanent maintenance.

He is to invite tenders for one or a period of years in the ordinary way, and the cost of maintenance is to be assessed against the rated occupiers of the holdings accommodated by the road in the proportion that rateable value of each of the holdings accommodated bears to the annual cost.

The persons liable for such assessment may nominate a person or persons to contract to maintain the road in accordance with the county surveyor's specifications, at a nominal sum, or any sum not exceeding the county surveyor's estimate.

(*b*.) Bog roads.

The Board shall lodge with the secretary of the County Council of the county in which the bog road is situate a map, showing site of road, and this map is to be accompanied by a schedule, giving the names, townlands, and poor law valuation of the rated occupiers who use the bog road as a means of access to their turbary supplies, and who are to be liable each for equal parts of the cost of maintenance of the road.

The county surveyor shall arrange for a contract for maintenance, as in the case of (*a*) roads above described.

* See p 11, q. 59,522.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX I.

If it should be decided that the Congested Districts Board's operations were to continue, and that the area under their control was extended to the entire of the counties containing congested districts, it may be considered more feasible to place upon the new Board the duty of securing the maintenance of all roads and drains made by them or their predecessors, instead of requiring the county authorities to undertake such duties. In this event the Congested Districts Board should have the same power of assessment and recovery of the outlay made, as above suggested for the county authorities. Another, and perhaps a more practicable mode of procedure would be —

1. That the Board would put into what they consider to be a reasonable state of repair, all roads and drains constructed by the Board.

2. That they would be empowered by law to schedule the holdings, the occupiers of which would be liable for the maintenance of each of the roads and of the drains, or portions thereof.

3. That they would subsequently, by notice in prescribed form, call upon the landholders liable for the maintenance of each road or drain, to name two or three trustees who would undertake to supervise and be responsible for the maintenance, such persons to have power to call upon all persons liable to assist in putting the road or drain in a proper state of repair at specified times, and in the event of their failure to do so, the trustees would employ other persons to do the work, and have summary powers to recover the cost of same at the local petty sessions court from the occupiers of the holdings who use the road or whose lands are benefited by the drainage.

This procedure would, of course, involve the settlement of a considerable amount of detail, which I do not consider it necessary to enter into here.

H. DORAN.

Pre-emption of Holdings.

The Congested Districts Board to be empowered to pre-empt all holdings offered for sale in the counties containing congested districts after 1st January, 1909, and no such sale to be valid after that date unless with the assent of the Congested Districts Board.

The price to be paid by the Board to be fixed by agreement, or failing agreement, by the tribunal appointed to fix the value of estates to be compulsorily purchased.

In the event of the Board ascertaining that a holding has come into possession of a new occupier in contravention of this enactment, they may serve notice upon the occupier to compulsorily acquire the holding, and thereupon the same procedure shall apply as may be arranged for the compulsory acquisition of holdings.

This to apply to sales by mortgagee or any covert form of alienation, including any case in which a mortgagee goes into possession of a holding.

H. DORAN.

NOTE.—The foregoing proposals would appear to meet cases of shopkeepers giving credit to a landholder with the object of acquiring the holding.—H. D.

D.—TABLE showing Loss on Estates purchased by the Board since 1903, and re-sold or ready for re-sale.

Class.	Number of Estates in each Class	Area at time of Purchase			Total Poor Law Valuation.	Purchase Money			Total Expenditure on Improvement Works.	Loss.	Per centage of Loss on Purchase Money	Total Number of Holdings at time of Sale	Number of Holdings under £10 Rent at time of Sale	Per centage of Holdings under £10 at time of Sale
		Tenanted.	Untenanted.	Total.		Tenanted Section.	Untenanted Land which includes Turbary, Bog, Mountain and Waste. Column 4	Total for Estate						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
A.	24	25,563	7,296	32,859	9,137	183,296	58,655	241,951	51,445	22,905	9 4	1,103	813	74
B.	16	17,323	1,782	19,105	2,326	43,762	5,690	49,452	18,635	10,685	21 6	614	571	93
C.	7	183	1,480	1,663	994	1,336	24,900	26,236	11,209	7,562	28 8	53	10	19
	47	43,069	*10,558	53,627	12,457	228,394	89,245	317,639	81,289	41,152	12 9	1,770	1,394	78

SUMMARY OF CLASS A AND CLASS B

A.	24	25,563	7,296	32,859	9,137	183,296	58,655	241,951	51,445	22,905	9 4	1,103	813	74
B.	16	17,323	1,782	19,105	2,326	43,762	5,690	49,452	18,635	10,685	21 6	614	571	93
	40	42,886	9,078	51,964	11,463	227,058	64,345	291,403	70,080	33,590	11 5	1,717	1,384	81

* On sixteen of these Estates there are 45,12 acres of Bog, Mountain and Waste, with a Poor Law Valuation of £255, and on the remainder of the Estates about 500 acres of small areas of Bog and Waste.

H. DORAN.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

E.—Summary of Prices paid by the Board for Ninety-one Tenanted Holdings, the Occupation Interest of which they acquired.

Tenure	How acquired	Number of Holdings	Rent	Poor Law Valuation.	Sum paid for Tenants' Interest.			Sum paid to Landlords			Total cost to Board		
					Amount	Number of years' purchase of Rent.	Number of years' purchase of Poor Law Valuation.	Amount.	Number of years' purchase of Rent.	Number of years' purchase of Poor Law Valuation.	Amount.	Number of years' purchase of Rent.	Number of years' purchase of Poor Law Valuation
			£ s. d	£ s. d.	£ s d			£ s d			£ s. d.		
1st Term. Judicial, ..	Voluntary Agreement	17	497 6 7	468 5 0	4,898 0 11	9 85	10 46	8,876 7 1	17 85	18-95	13,774 8 0	27·71	29 41
Do.,	Pre-emption. Price fixed at sum offered by intending purchasers	15	202 7 9	173 19 0	2,725 14 3	13 46	15 69	3,973 0 3	19 62	22-84	6,698 14 6	33-09	38-53
Do., .	Notice of Resumption. Price fixed by Land Commission	2	96 18 6	101 0 0	1,050 0 0	10 84	10 40	1,895 13 10	19-56	18-77	2,945 16 10	30-40	29·17
		34	796 12 10	743 4 0	8,673 15 2	10 89	11·67	14,745 1 2	18-51	19 83	23,418 16 4	29-40	31·50
2nd Term, Judicial,	Voluntary Agreement, .	3	8 0 4	8 0 0	145 0 0	17-13	18-13	169 15 0	20 05	21·22	314 15 0	37 13	39 34
Do,	Notice of Resumption. Price fixed by Land Commission	1	24 15 0	24 0 0	300 0 0	12 12	12-50	575 11 3	23 26	23-96	875 11 3	35-38	36 46
		4	33 4 4	32 0 0	445 0 0	13 40	13 91	745 6 3	22-45	23-28	1,190 6 3	35·85	37·19
NON-JUDICIAL.													
Present Tenancies, ..	Voluntary Agreement,	11	951 11 11	814 12 10	8,215 0 0	8 66	10 08	16,316 2 5	17-15	20-03	24,531 2 5	25-78	30·11
Do., .	Pre-emption. Price fixed at sum offered by intending purchasers	7	18 19 10	17 17 0	365 9 11	19 25	20 48	363 13 8	17·57	18-69	699 3 7	36-82	39·17
		18	970 11 9	832 9 10	8,580 9 11	8·84	10·31	16,649 18 1	17 15	20 00	25,230 6 0	25-99	30·31
Future Tenancies, .	Notice to Quit. Compensation fixed by Agreement	16	1,248 5 0	1,120 15 0	4,206 0 0	3 38	3 75	22,936 6 8	18 43	20 52	27,202 6 8	21-81	24 27
Do, ..	Agreement, ...	11	742 8 10	1,212 12 0	4,077 10 0	5-49	3-36	11,435 8 3	15 42	9 43	15,512 18 3	20 89	12·79
		27	1,990 13 10	2,333 7 0	8,286 10 0	4 16	3 55	34,431 14 11	17·30	14 76	42,715 4 11	21 46	18·31
Lease for Grazing, ..	Agreement, ...	4	680 0 0	506 5 0	1,354 10 1	1 99	2 67	12,000 8 4	17-65	23·71	13,354 18 5	19 64	26-38
		4	680 0 0	506 5 0	1,354 10 1	1·99	2 67	12,000 8 4	17 65	23-71	13,354 18 5	19-64	26·38
Leaseholds, ..	Agreement, ...	4	355 13 4	357 12 0	4,700 0 0	13-21	13 14	7,251 18 8	20·39	20 28	11,951 18 8	33·60	33-42
		4	355 13 4	357 12 0	4,700 0 0	13·21	13 14	7,251 13 8	20 39	20-28	11,951 18 8	33-60	33 42

NOTE.—The rents of the Judicial Holdings and of the agricultural leaseholds did not include the value of buildings or improvements owned by the tenants. The price paid for the occupation interests includes these, buildings and improvements.

H. DORAN.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX

F.—Return of Non-Residential Holdings over £25 Poor Law Valuation in the Counties containing

WITHIN THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS.

1. Counties	2. Tenant-Purchasers. A.			3. Judicial Tenants. B.			4. Future Tenants. C.			5. Tenancies from Year to Year. D.		
	No.	Area.	Total Rateable Valuation.	No.	Area.	Total Rateable Valuation.	No.	Area.	Total Rateable Valuation.	No.	Area.	Total Rateable Valuation
		A. R. P.	£ s		A. R. P.	£ s		A. R. P.	£ s.		A. R. P.	£ s
Donegal, ..	5	403 2 30	182 13	13	1,214 2 24	438 3	—	—	—	6	3,420 3 26	211 15
Leitrim, ..	7	800 0 1	351 5	7	556 1 38	287 15	3	189 3 4	89 5	—	—	—
Sligo, ..	8	526 2 39	314 0	24	2,818 3 18	1,173 6	—	—	—	6	717 3 16	281 5
Mayo, ..	8	6,363 0 37	331 15	32	6,007 0 17	1,330 13	8	2,261 0 39	509 13	35	30,339 1 12	1,751 0
Roscommon, ..	7	789 2 14	319 15	6	531 1 37	205 3	—	—	—	9	1,009 1 32	455 17
Galway, ..	8	4,341 0 14	471 5	9	1,759 3 14	454 15	—	—	—	17	6,265 1 23	785 5
Kerry, ..	9	1 207 1 34	665 5	6	808 2 8	211 0	2	114 0 0	28 15	2	80 0 0	71 0
Cork, Bantry, Castletown, Skibbereen, Schull,	2	187 1 9	69 0	11	856 1 6	390 10	3	378 2 11	102 0	—	—	—
Clare, ..	—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—	—	—	—
Total in Congested Districts.	54	14,619 0 18	2,704 18	108	14,553 1 2	4,491 5	16	2,943 2 14	729 13	75	41,832 3 29	3,556 2

IN THE NON-CONGESTED DISTRICTS

Donegal ..	154	10,003 3 36	7,362 13	130	7,439 2 39	5,571 19	2	120 2 28	126 10	12	662 3 19	523 2
Leitrim, ..	50	4,078 1 15	2,337 8	38	2,555 1 9	1,585 8	1	67 1 4	25 10	4	457 1 9	200 0
Sligo, ..	96	8,463 0 8	5,571 18	110	9,738 0 8	5,970 2	1	147 2 20	116 0	33	2,655 1 12	1,908 7
Mayo, ..	33	4,663 1 22	2,219 12	77	8,896 0 29	4,116 8	29	4,248 2 20	1,997 4	74	9 257 1 14	5,045 5
Roscommon, ..	218	26,357 2 1	16,947 13	96	11,415 1 37	8,079 1	5	281 0 10	178 0	88	12,097 1 3	8,648 0
Galway ..	156	20,875 0 37	10,840 6	76	7,638 1 13	4,099 6	8	1,015 3 36	385 19	168	23,352 0 12	11,563 5
Kerry, ..	50	4,175 0 14	2,082 10	27	3 082 0 5	1,461 19	6	713 3 6	304 5	17	2,518 1 34	718 5
Cork, Bantry, Castletown, Skibbereen, Schull,	12	1,340 0 13	489 15	19	1,872 2 35	971 5	2	123 1 0	87 0	1	92 1 13	72 0
Clare, ..	155	17,940 1 5	9,574 1	228	21,005 0 6	13,581 10	15	1,464 3 12	790 5	82	9,781 3 5	5,374 4
Total in Non-Congested Districts.	924	97,896 3 31	57,425 16	801	73,642 3 21	45,436 18	69	8,183 0 16	4,010 13	479	60,874 3 1	34 052 8
Grand Total,	978	112,516 0 9	60,130 14	909	88,196 0 23	49,928 3	85	11,126 2 30	4,740 6	554	102,707 2 30	37,608 10

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

I.—*continued.*

Congested Districts—distinguishing those situate within the Scheduled Area and those outside.

WITHIN THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS

6. Leaseholds. E.						7. Agistment or other Temporary Lettings. F.					8. Lands Held in Fee-Simple. G.					9. Total Number, Area, and Valuation of Tenements included in Columns 2 to 8 (inclusive).					Counties.
No	Area.			Total Rateable Valuation		No.	Area.			Total Rateable Valuation.	No	Area.			Total Rateable Valuation	No.	Total Area.			Total Rateable Valuation	
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.		A.	R.	P.	£ s.		A.	R.	P.	£ s.		A.	R.	P.	£ s.	
8	1,545	2	13	371	15	1	48	0	0	33 15	16	10,538	0	35	714 7	49	17,171	0	8	1,952 8	Donegal.
3	379	3	12	192	10	1	652	0	0	33 10	6	1,039	3	28	322 3	27	3,618	0	3	1,276 8	Leitrim.
1	121	2	0	77	12	—	—			—	7	2,359	1	34	929 17	46	6,544	1	27	2,776 0	Sligo.
24	14,941	3	1	1,847	1	15	8,785	0	1	725 14	44	29,486	0	31	2,802 8	166	98,183	3	18	9,298 14	Mayo.
2	344	2	14	152	15	4	661	2	35	219 10	4	514	2	10	742 10	32	3,851	1	22	2,095 10	Roscommon.
5	1 322	2	1	383	4	26	14,341	2	2	1 459 13	35	11,227	2	30	1,928 7	100	39,258	0	4	5,492 9	Galway.
3	137	2	5	113	0	2	123	0	16	58 10	10	2,791	3	2	619 3	34	5 262	1	25	1,766 13	Kerry.
2	98	0	2	77	15	—	—			—	6	1,117	0	38	290 10	24	2,637	1	26	929 15	Bantry, Castletown, Skibbereen, Schull, — Cork.
—	—			—		—	—			—	2	1,831	0	27	121 4	2	1,831	0	27	121 4	Clare
48	18,891	1	8	3,215	12	49	24,611	1	14	2,531 2	130	60,906	0	35	8,470 9	480	178,357	3	0	25,699 1	Total in Congested Districts.

IN THE NON-CONGESTED DISTRICTS.

69	5,331	2	5	3,114	16	—	—			—	77	18,002	0	17	5,024 9	444	41,560	3	24	21,723 9	Donegal.
1	416	1	2	153	0	3	185	3	21	159 5	34	6,758	3	19	1,953 10	131	14,519	0	39	6,414 1	Leitrim.
18	1,681	3	6	1,170	0	32	3,477	3	2	2,038 2	116	17,862	3	18	10,465 16	406	44,026	1	34	27,240 5	Sligo.
56	13,527	3	27	4,767	10	61	10,896	1	2	4,835 3	167	30,243	3	5	16,324 14	497	81,733	1	39	39,305 16	Mayo.
80	13,669	2	28	9,713	8	66	9,746	2	29	5,759 5	178	33,466	2	27	20,127 10	731	107,034	1	15	69,452 17	Roscommon.
64	12,811	3	24	5,948	10	437	70,761	2	20	32,631 11	447	82,676	2	3	37,196 10	1,356	219,131	2	25	102,665 7	Galway.
20	2,526	0	20	1,192	6	9	568	0	8	645 0	58	10,992	0	0	4,108 10	187	24,575	2	7	10,512 15	Kerry.
2	31	2	21	78	15	1	95	2	14	29 0	13	1,461	0	3	914 10	50	5,016	2	19	2,642 5	Bantry, Castletown, Skibbereen, Schull, Cork.
35	6,255	0	14	3,184	18	42	9 704	3	37	2,590 2	188	27,487	2	2	14,893 12	745	93 639	2	1	49,988 12	Clare
345	56,251	3	27	29,323	3	651	105,436	3	13	48,687 8	1,278	228,951	1	14	111,009 1	4,547	631,237	3	3	329,945 7	Total in Non-Congested Districts.
393	75,143	0	35	32,538	15	700	130,048	0	27	51,218 10	1,408	289,857	2	9	119,479 10	5,027	809,595	2	3	355,644 8	Grand Total

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX

TABLE SUPPLIED BY THE SECRETARY

RETURNS, to 31st December, 1907, showing (*a*) for the Congested Districts Counties, and (*b*) for the ENTIRE Administrative Advances Made and Applications Pending under the Irish Church Act, 1869, Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870, Land Act, 1903, to enable Tenants and Others to purchase Holdings or Parcels of Land

RETURN

CONGESTED DISTRICTS COUNTY.	I—ACTS 1891-1896							
	Advances made to 31st December, 1907		Applications pending on 31st December, 1907.		Total		Advances made to 31st December 190[illegible]	
	No.	Amount.	No	Amount.	No	Amount	No.	Amount
		£		£		£		£
Donegal,	1,188	87,495	—	—	1,188	87,495	635	59,261
Galway,	808	97,002	—	—	808	97,002	219	30,499
Leitrim,	1,144	117,555	—	—	1,144	117,555	281	30,201
Mayo,	2,741	212,409	16	1,147	2,757	213,556	1,933	200,582
Roscommon,	679	57,904	3	154	682	58,058	1,204	153,518
Sligo,	379	35,972	—	—	379	35,972	309	44,442
Clare,	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cork,	62	15,084	—	—	62	15,084	218	39,349
Kerry,	450	75,960	—	—	450	75,960	536	128,659
Total,	7,451	699,381	19	1,301	7,470	700,682	5,335	686,511

1. The figures under the Heading "Advances made" Act, 1903, include amounts advanced for the purchase of Estates by the Estate
2. The figures under the Irish Land Act, 1903, include resales made by the Congested Districts Board to tenants on Estates purchased by
3. The figures under Heading "Applications Pending" Act, 1903 include estimated figures for resales of Estates offered for sale to

RETURN

ENTIRE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY.	Irish Church Act, 1869 (*a*)		Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870 (*b*)		Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881 (*c*)		Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1885. (*d*)		Total of Acts, 1869 to 1885		ACTS 1891-1896.			
											Advances made to 31st December, 1907		Applications Pending on 31st December 1907	
	No of Purchasers	Amount of Purchase Money secured by Mortgage	No. of Purchasers	Amount Advanced	No. of Purchasers	Amount Advanced	No of Purchasers	Amount Advanced	No	Amount	No.	Amount.	No	Amount
		£		£		£		£		£		£		£
Donegal,	457	64,390	66	36,213	–	–	681	237,462	1,204	338,065	1,734	276,458	–	—
Galway,	115	29,888	9	11,063	9	3,724	951	255,270	1,084	299,945	2,991	648,508	–	—
Leitrim,	265	60,105	4	973	20	2,659	539	94,620	828	158,357	2,871	399,298	–	—
Mayo,	148	8,903	5	2,752	278	20,853	524	133,753	955	166,261	3,124	309,978	16	1,147
Roscommon,	65	13,047	11	20,892	50	11,035	649	118,149	775	163,123	2,437	437,858	5	662
Sligo,	12	8,568	1	1,533	1	2,250	325	61,188	339	73,534	777	135,234	–	—
Clare,	89	10,125	53	27,378	–	–	192	55,299	334	92,802	1,496	408,355	21	1,674
Cork,	189	37,536	54	32,599	8	5,425	1,361	926,089	1,612	1,001,649	2,203	1,044,410	4	5,065
Kerry,	182	12,876	2	1,840	–	–	1,178	563,608	1,362	578,319	1,153	396,160	–	—
Totals,	1,522	245,433	205	135,248	366	45,946	6,400	2,445,433	8,493	2,872,055	18,786	4,056,259	46	9,148
Totals for the whole of Ireland.	6,057	1,674,841*	877	514,536*	731	240,801*	25,367	9,992,586	33,032	12,422,714	46,798	13,136,570	792	116,482

*Taken from House of Commons

(*a*) Irish Church Act, 1869.—The purchasers in these cases included purchasers of residues subject to the existing tenancies and to Tenants of large properties distinguish between the classes of Purchasing tenants. In these cases three-fourths of the purchase money might remain outstanding on Mortgage
(*b*) Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870.—Under this Act an Advance could be made to a tenant of a sum not exceeding two thirds of the Purchase-
(*c*) Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881.—Under this Act Advances could be made of sums not exceeding three-fourths of the Purchase money of the holding
(*d*) Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1885.—Under this Act the entire Purchase-money could be advanced subject to the retention of a sum of not less than
The figures under the Heading "Advances Made" Act, 1903, include amounts advanced for the purchase of Estates by the Estates Commissioners under
The figures under the Irish Land Act, 1903, include resales made by the Congested Districts Board to tenants on Estates purchased by them, but do
The figures under Heading "Applications Pending" Act, 1903, include estimated figures for Estates offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners under

DUBLIN, *19th February*, 1908.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

F THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

ounties in which there are Districts scheduled as "CONGESTED," and for the whole of Ireland, the Number and Amount of and Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1885, Purchase of Land (Ireland) Acts, 1891–96, and the Irish

a)

II.—ACT 1903				III.—TOTALS OF ACTS 1891–6 AND 1903						CONGESTED DISTRICTS COUNTY.
Applications pending on 31st December, 1907		Total		Advances made to 31st December, 1907		Applications pending on 31st December, 1907		Gross Total		
No.	Amount	No	Amount	No.	Amount.	No	Amount	No.	Amount	
	£		£		£		£		£	
1,975	158,554	2,610	217,815	1,823	146,756	1,975	158,554	3,798	305,310	Donegal
906	106,080	1,125	136,579	1,027	127,501	906	106,080	1,933	233,581	Galway
1,487	143,060	1,768	173,261	1,425	147,756	1,487	143,060	2,912	290,816	Leitrim
871	116,203	2,804	316,785	4,674	412,991	887	117,350	5,561	530,341	Mayo.
640	80,143	1,844	233,661	1,883	211,422	643	80,297	2,526	291,719	Roscommon
454	54,332	763	98,774	688	80,414	454	54,332	1,142	134,746	Sligo
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Clare
1,023	200,047	1,241	239,396	280	54,433	1,023	200,047	1,303	254,480	Cork.
1,120	223,730	1,656	352,389	986	204,619	1,120	223,730	2,106	428,349	Kerry
8,476	1,082,149	13,811	1,768,660	12,786	1,385,892	8,495	1,083,450	21,281	2,469,342	Total

Commissioners under Sections 6, 7, and 8.
Ibes, but do not include the Purchase Money of Estates where Advances were made to the Board under the Act for such purchase.
he Estates Commissioners under Sections 6 7 and 8, for which offers to purchase have not yet been made by them

(b)

Total		ACT 1903						TOTALS OF ACTS 1869 TO 1903						ENTIRE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY.
		Advances Made to 31st December, 1907		Applications Pending on 31st December 1907.		Total		Advances Made to 31st December, 1907		Applications Pending on 31st December, 1907.		Gross Total		
No.	Amount	No	Amount.	No	Amount.	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No	Amount	No	Amount	
	£		£		£		£		£		£		£	
1,934	276,458	1,936	413,724	4,587	875,537	6,520	1,289,261	4,871	1,028,247	4,587	875,537	9,458	1,903,784	Donegal
4,961	648,508	2,968	935,084	6,170	1,444,088	9,138	2,379,172	7,043	1,883,537	6,170	1,444,088	13,213	3,327,625	Galway
1,871	399,298	503	61,367	2,880	389,404	3,383	450,771	4,202	619,022	2,880	389,404	7,082	1,008,426	Leitrim.
4,110	311,125	2,583	416,738	1,515	280,170	4,098	696,908	6,662	892,977	1,531	281,317	8,193	1,174,294	Mayo
4,142	438,520	3,884	941,123	4,184	975,336	8,068	1,916,459	7,096	1,542,104	4,189	975,998	11,285	2,518,102	Roscommon
777	135,234	1,502	390,755	2,289	488,332	3,791	879,087	2,618	599,523	2,289	488,332	4,907	1,087,855	Sligo.
1,514	410,029	900	256,640	2,344	703,196	3,244	959,836	2,730	757,797	2,365	704,870	5,095	1,462,667	Clare.
9,930	1,050,075	2,838	1,411,330	10,926	4,898,761	13,764	6,310,091	6 653	3,457,389	10,930	4,904,426	17,583	8,361,815	Cork.
1,193	396,160	1,311	416,720	4,034	1,259,510	5,345	1,676,230	3,826	1,391,199	4,034	1,259,510	7,860	2,650,709	Kerry
18,332	4,065,407	18,422	5,243,481	38,929	11,314,334	57,351	16,557,815	45,701	12,171,795	38,975	11,328,482	84,676	23,495,277	Totals.
47,390	13,253,052	48,891	19,252,612	114,184	37,058,121	163,075	56,310,733	128,721	44,811,896	114,976	37,174,603	243,697	81,986,499	Totals for the whole of Ireland

Return No 90—Session 1903
wholly sub-let, the object being to realize the Estates of the late Established Church The records of the Church Temporalities Commission do not
money of the holding

one-fifth of the Advance as a 'Guarantee Deposit."
Sections 6, 7, and 8.
not include the Purchase Money of Estates where Advances were made to the Board under the Act for such purchase
Sections 6, 7, and 8 for which offers to purchase have not yet been made by them

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III.

DOCUMENT put in by Mr. F. W. D. MITCHELL in connection with his Evidence before the Commission

A.—TABLE showing Appropriation of Board's Income—Present and Proposed.

Services.		Present.	Proposed
		£	£
Administrative Expenses for Estate business	Outdoor Staff and Expenses,	9,900*	32,800*
	Indoor Staff and Office Maintenance,	12,100	26,700
	Law Staff and Expenses,	3,000	6,500
		25,000	66,000
4. General Administration,		11,000	12,000
5. Interest on Borrowed Money, say £100,000 at present and £200,000 in future,		3,500	7,000
6. Interest on £50,000 Floating Capital		—	1,750
7. Loss on Estates,		11,000	150,000
8. Industrial Classes, &c.,		9,000	15,000
9. Fisheries and Instruction,		3,000‡	7,000
10. Parish Committees,		12,000	20,000
11. Steamer Services,		3,700	3,700
12. Piers and Roads,		5,750	10,000
13. Agriculture—Contribution of £2,000 to Department of Agriculture, Grants to Shows, &c.,		2,300	†
		£86,250	£292,450

* The cost of Clerks of Works, Surveyors, Paymasters, Stock-managers, Bailiffs, and Herds is not included in the cost of out-door staff given above as hitherto; the salaries and expenses of these officers have been charged against the individual estates, not against administration.

† I am not in a position to make any estimate of the increase necessary under this head. F. W. D. M.

‡ In addition to the above expenditure out of income about £8,000 per annum is issued in loans to fishermen from the Irish Reproduction Loan Fund and the Sea and Coast Fisheries Fund. The repayments annually amount to about the same sum.

N.B.—Items 1-3 and 5-7 are all part of the cost of land re-settlement. The increases proposed have been estimated by Mr. Doran. Items 5 and 6 represent interest charges on money spent on improvements on estates, but ultimately repayable as enhanced price, money required for stocking grass lands in Board's hands, and for loans, &c.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

B.—TABLES SHOWING EXPENDITURE ON SCHEMES UNDERTAKEN BY THE BOARD.

(i.)—Table showing Expenditure for General Purposes.

Cost to 31st March, 1907.

Scheme	Gross Outlay.	Return	Net Cost.
	£	£	£
Subsidies for Steamer Services (General Services), ...	7,399	–	7,399*
Instruction in Domestic Economy (approximate), ...	5,000	–	5,000
Nursing Schemes, ...	2,869	100	2,769
Roads and Bridges (Inland only), ...	83,625	–	83,625
	83,893	100	83,793
Administration (approximate only), ...	10,000	–	10,000

* See also Fisheries.

(ii.)—Table showing Expenditure on Fisheries.

Cost to 31st March, 1907.

Scheme	Gross Outlay.	Return	Net Cost.
	£	£	£
Instruction in Curing, ...	5,583	–	5,583
" Fishing, ...	50,300	6,771	43,529
" Boat-building, ...	560	–	560*
" Net-mending, ...	1,327	250	1,077
" Barrel-making, ...	2,866	62	2,804
Purchase, Curing, and Sale of Fish, ...	119,005	86,646	30,359
Fishing Experiments (including Subsidies), ...	3,384	830	2,554
Providing Boats, Nets, and Gear, ...	74,195	55,157	19,038
Manufacture of Barrels, ...	20,072	21,472	(1,400) *profit*
Marine Works, viz.:—			
Piers and Harbour Improvements, ...	36,807	7,523	29,284
Boat Slips, Landing Places, or Quays, ...	28,222	–	28,222
Lights, Removal of Rocks, Dredging Sea Walls, &c. ...	8,616	–	6,916
Contribution to Telegraphic Services, ...	1,330	100	1,230
Subsidies for Steamer Services (part of), ...	8,000	–	8,000†
	358,567	180,811	177,756
Administration (approximation only), ...	–		70,000

	Total Advanced.	Repayments, Principal and Interest	Total of Outstanding Annuities
Loans:—	£	£	£
To Fishermen, ...	87,995	62,714‡	27,917§
" Coopers, ...	7,619	6,069	740
" Steamship Company, ...	2,300	2,505‖	Nil
	97,914	71,288	28,657

* Also £4,722 in "Boats, Nets, and Gear" for Materials and Labour.
† See also General Purposes.
‡ Includes about £2,500 Interest.
§ About £25,000 of this is principal; £2,787 has been written off as Bad Debts.
‖ Includes £205 Interest.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

(iii.)—Table showing Expenditure on Agricultural Schemes.

Cost to 31st March, 1907

Scheme	Gross Outlay	Return.	Net Cost.
	£	£	£
1 Live Stock—Horses, Cattle, Swine, Sheep, ...	112,274	25,031	87,243
2 Poultry and Eggs, ...	7,552	705	6,847
3. Bee-keeping and Sale of Honey, ...	6,316	4,545	1,771
4 Instruction in Farming	22,669	539	22,130
5 Planting (Forestry and Shelter Belts), ...	10,376	407	9,969
6. Seeds and Manures, ...	8,243	7,122	1,121
7. Farm Implements, ...	2,684	2,091	593
8 Potato Spraying, ...	7 523	2,755	4,763
9. Gardening (Markets &c.)	3,230	575	2,655
10 Subsidies to Exhibitions, ...	630	–	630
11. Subsidy to Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (since 1st April 1904)	6,000	–	6,000
12 Subsidy to Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, ...	2,768	–	2,768
	190,265	43,770	146,495
Administration (approximate)	–	–	74,700

	Total Advanced	Repayments, Principal and Interest	Total of Outstanding Annuities.
Loans —	£	£	£
To Credit Banks, ...	6,705	1,735	5,930
„ Farmers for House Improvement, ...	940	64	900
„ Farmers for other purposes, ...	6,698	3,814	3,708
	14,343	5,613	10,538

(iv.)—Table showing Expenditure on Textile and other Industries.

Cost to 31st March, 1907.

Scheme	Gross Outlay	Return.	Net Cost.
Subsidies to Factories —	£	£	£
Foxford—Weaving, ...	9,497	–	9,497
Ballaghadereen—Hosiery, ...	4 416	–	4,416
Donegal—Carpets, ...	3,053	–	3,053
Ballyshannon—Shirtmaking, ...	127	–	127
Bundoran— do., ...	100	–	100
Instruction in Lace, Crochet, and Curtain-making	42,524	5,246	37,278
„ Weaving, ...	5,025	505	4,520
„ Knitting, ...	332	–	332
„ Carpentry, &c., ...	600	60	540
Sundry Industries, ...	3 698	984	2 714
Subsidies to Exhibitions, ...	1,725	–	1,725
	71,097	6,795	64,302
Administration (approximate only).	–	–	27,000

	Total Advanced	Repayments, Principal and Interest.	Total of Outstanding Annuities.
Loans —	£	£	£
Foxford Factory	7,000	7 280*	1,456†
Ballaghadereen Factory, ...	3 000	2,435‡	1,590†
Looms, Knitting Machines, &c., Kelp-making, &c.,	4,693	2,617	2,393§
	14,693	12,332	5,439

* Includes about £1,500 Interest.
† Total sum still payable to Board, including Interest
‡ Includes about £650 Interest.
§ £131 Bad Debts written off

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

DOCUMENTS AND STATISTICS SUBMITTED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION.

A.—MEMORANDUM AND STATISTICS RELATING TO AMOUNT OF CROPS GROWN AND CATTLE CARRIED ON DIFFERENT CLASSES OF HOLDINGS.

Tables XIII. to XVI. in the following return (pages 70–87) were collected for the Commission by the Department of Agriculture in connection with the Annual Agricultural Statistics, and Tables I.–XII. (pages 56-69) were prepared in the Office of the Commission. Tables XIII. and XV contain information, by counties, as to the number of acres under various crops and as to the number of various classes of cattle, not only on the total number of holdings in each county (as do the Annual Agricultural Statistics), but also the total for each of six classes of holdings (arranged according to acreage) in each county. Tables XIV. and XVI translate these absolute figures into percentages.

The importance of this return is that it renders it possible to compare with statistical precision the amount of tillage and the number of cattle carried on small and large farms respectively. Owing to lack of such information it has not been hitherto possible to compare statistically the working of different sizes of holdings. One instance will suffice to illustrate the point. Irish economists have often sought in vain (*cf.* Ireland : Industrial and Agricultural, page 318–9, and the Report of the late Dr. Coyne on the Agricultural Statistics of Ireland for 1902, Cd. 1614–1903, p. xxv.) to get information as to the exact number of acres occupied by different classes of holdings in Ireland (classified according to acreage). As special information had been collected as to the acreage under each crop in each of six classes of holdings, it was rendered easy to obtain the total acreage by cross summation, and accordingly this is given in the second column of Tables XIII–XV.

As these Tables are necessarily somewhat detailed, summary Tables indicating some of the most important points were prepared in the Office of the Commission. In Tables I. to III. (pages 56–61) and in Table VII. to IX. (page 68) a contrast is drawn between the holdings under and over 50 acres in the counties with which the Commission are mainly concerned, but in Tables I. to III. the figures are also given for the whole of Ireland. As regards the smaller area, it appears that 84 per cent. of the holdings are under 50 acres, but these occupy only 44·5 per cent. of the total area, though they carry 59·6 per cent. of the total number of cattle. On the holdings under 50 acres there are about two-thirds of the total number of milch cows and of the total number of cattle under two years old, whilst the larger holdings carry about two-thirds of the total number of bulls and of the cattle two years old and upwards. Making no distinction between the different classes of cattle, there are 3 acres for each head of cattle on the small farms, and 5·6 acres on the large farms. The percentage of the land that is under corn crops on the small holdings is 6·9 per cent and on the large holdings 2·3 per cent. The percentage under potatoes on the two classes of holdings is respectively 5·6 and 1 2, and under other green crops 2·2 and ·9. Similarly the percentage of the area under first, second, and third years' hay, pasture under rotation and under permanent meadow is much larger on the small holdings than on the large, and the percentage under permanent pasture is slightly larger on the small holdings. On the other hand, the mountain land grazed on the small holdings is under 10 per cent of the total area, and on the large holdings it is 34 per cent. Consequently in drawing any comparison between the utilisation of the land on the two classes of holdings it is important to bear in mind the fact that whereas under one-tenth of the small holdings is occupied by rough mountain grazing over one-third of the large holdings is so occupied. It may be noted that the percentages of the mountain land grazed forms of the total area are much smaller when the whole of Ireland is taken, being 5 per cent and 18 per cent. respectively.

Tables IV. to VI. (pages 62–7) contain a summary for the counties of Donegal, Galway, Leitrim, Mayo, Roscommon, Sligo, Clare and Kerry, and for the whole of Ireland of the salient features of the returns made out for three classes of holdings, namely, those under 30 acres, those between 30 and 200 acres and those exceeding 200, whilst Tables X. to XII. (page 69) contain a summary of the same results for the total of the eight counties mentioned. Some of the results indicated are undoubtedly striking. Thus the smallest class of holdings, though they form 70 per cent. of the total number, occupy less than 30 per cent. of the total area. They, however, carry over 41 per cent. of the total number of cattle The largest class of holdings forming 2·2 per cent. of the total number of holdings occupy 23·2 per cent. of the area and carry 9·6 per cent. of the cattle, and there is for each head of cattle on these large farms 9·9 acres as against 2·9 acres on the small holdings. In drawing any deduction, however, as to the comparative efficiency of the largest and the smallest holding it must be remembered that the cattle on the small holdings are mainly milch cows and young stock, whilst the cattle on the larger holdings consist mainly of stores. Again, it must be borne in mind that over half the area of the large holdings is returned as mountain land grazed, whilst only one-twelfth of the small holdings is so returned. After making allowance for this factor it is still worthy of note that a quarter of the land occupied by holdings under 30 acres is in course of going under the plough, that is, it is under crops or hay or pasture under rotation, whereas little more than one-twentieth of the total area of the largest holdings is so occupied

WALTER CALLAN

Secretary.

30th March, 1908.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

I.—TABLE showing, as regards holdings (*a*) over and (*b*) under 50 acres, the number of such holdings, the area area occupied by each class of crops is of

(*a*).—HOLDINGS

County.	1.	2.	3.		4.		5.		6.		7.	
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land	Total Area under Corn Crops	Percentage of Total Area.	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Potatoes	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Flax	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Hay, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years	Percentage of Total Area
	No.	Acres	Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres.		Acres	
Donegal, ..	4,651	461,648	30,988	6 7	16,227	3 5	8,205	1 8	3,324	0-7	8,941	2-0
Galway, ..	4,560	640,408	10,049	1 6	10,375	1-6	5,213	0-8	—	—	6,902	1 1
Leitrim, .	871	68,260	803	1 2	1,282	1-9	968	1-4	—	—	498	0 7
Mayo, ..	2,953	468,538	5,199	1 1	5,240	1 1	3,477	0 7	9	0-0	3,115	0-7
Roscommon,	1,756	207,025	2,968	1 4	3,584	1-7	2,035	1 0	—	—	2,387	1 2
Sligo, ..	1,253	137,912	2,672	2-0	2,909	2-1	1,786	1 3	1	0 0	2,261	1 6
Clare,	4,140	401,999	5,106	1 3	8,625	2 1	4,948	1 2	—	—	3,347	0-8
Kerry, ..	6,342	624,748	12,798	2 0	15,477	2-5	9,191	1 5	—	—	9,238	1-5
Total,	26,526	3,010,533	70,578	2·3	63,719	2-1	35,823	1 2	3,334	0 1	36,689	1 2
Total for all Ireland,	91,000	9,500,345	538,664	5 6	349,067	3-7	156,985	1 7	16,864	0-2	370,415	3-9

(*b*).—HOLDINGS

County.	1.	2	3.		4.		5.		6.		7	
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land	Total Area under Corn Crops	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Potatoes.	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Flax.	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Hay, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years	Percentage of Total Area
	No	Acres	Acres		Acres.		Acres		Acres.		Acres.	
Donegal, ..	22,971	387,553	51,979	13 4	35,972	9 3	25,208	6-5	2,986	0-8	12,286	3-2
Galway, ..	25,355	426,690	31,277	7 3	56,583	8 6	25,334	5-9	—	—	15,386	3 6
Leitrim, .	12,214	221,383	6,944	3-1	12,261	5 6	10,103	4 6	9	0 0	2,501	1 1
Mayo,	28,092	434,431	34,709	8 0	37,124	8 5	29,598	6-8	28	0-0	17,178	4 0
Roscommon,	16,426	250,485	13,603	5 4	20,272	8 1	14,772	5 9	—	—	6,966	2-8
Sligo,	11,445	200,924	10,137	5-0	13,771	6 9	10,384	5 2	—	—	7,252	3 6
Clare,	11,855	254,575	6,723	2 6	15,160	6-0	10,320	4-0	—	—	3,380	1 3
Kerry, ..	10,970	258,619	10,803	4-5	16,141	6 8	10,809	4 5	—	—	6,744	2-8
Total,	139,328	2,414,670	166,180	6-9	187,304	7 8	136,528	5 6	3,023	0 1	71,693	3 0
Total for all Ireland,	363,287	6,769,709	729,479	10 8	588,066	8-7	393,878	5 8	42,608	0-6	437,176	6 5

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

occupied by these holdings; the area occupied by various classes of crops on these holdings; and the percentage the the total area occupied by these holdings.

ABOVE 50 ACRES.

8		9		10		11		12		13		County
Pasture under Rotation	Per-centage of Total Area	Permanent Meadow	Per-centage of Total Area	Permanent Pasture	Per-centage of Total Area	Mountain Land grazed.	Per-centage of Total Area.	Total of Cols 3–8 (excluding Potatoes, Col 5).	Per-centage of Total Area	Total of Cols 9 11 (inclusive)	Per-centage of Total Area	
Acres.		Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres.		Acres		
37,628	8·1	13,210	2 9	91,958	19 9	259,372	56 1	97,108	21 0	364,540	79·0	Donegal.
9,826	1 5	31,829	4 9	378,494	59 1	193,479	30·2	37,152	5 8	603,256	94·2	Galway.
1,256	1 8	9,014	13·2	44,922	65 8	10,485	15 4	3,839	5 6	64,421	94 4	Leitrim.
4,958	1 1	12,920	2·7	185,948	39·7	251,113	53 6	18,521	4 0	450,017	96 0	Mayo.
1,967	1 0	21,185	10·2	173,039	83·6	1,900	0 9	10,601	5 3	196,124	94 7	Roscommon.
1,758	1 3	7,860	5 7	89,395	64·8	31,056	22 5	9,601	7 0	128,311	93 0	Sligo
2,355	0 6	46,217	11 5	266,799	66·4	69,550	17 3	19,433	4 8	382,566	95 2	Clare.
11,092	1 8	51,032	8·1	310,182	51 1	205,924	33·0	48,605	7 8	576,138	92 2	Kerry.
70,840	2 4	192,727	6·4	1,549 773	51 5	1,022,873	34 0	245,160	8·1	2,765,373	91 9	Total
550,828	5·8	693,038	7·3	5,272,635	55·5	1,708,834	18 0	1,825,838	19·2	7,674,507	80 8	Total for all Ireland.

UNDER 50 ACRES.

8		9.		10.		11		12.		13.		County.
Pasture under Rotation	Per-centage of Total Area	Permanent Meadow	Per-centage of Total Area	Permanent Pasture	Per-centage of Total Area	Mountain Land grazed	Per-centage of Total Area	Total of Cols 3–8 (excluding Potatoes, Col 5)	Per-centage of Total Area	Total of Cols 9-11 (inclusive)	Per-centage of Total Area	
Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres		
43,495	11 2	31,671	8 2	110,262	28 4	96,012	25 5	146,718	37 9	240,845	62 1	Donegal.
22,823	5·4	41,596	9 7	248,104	58 1	30,921	7 3	102,009	24 9	320,621	75 1	Galway.
6,529	3·0	42,439	19 2	144,675	65 3	6,005	2·7	28,264	12·8	193,119	87 2	Leitrim.
32,708	7 5	32,048	7 4	241,411	55 6	39,225	9 0	121,747	28·0	312,684	72 0	Mayo.
8,507	3 4	43,765	17 5	154,175	61·5	3,197	1·3	49,348	19 7	201,137	80 3	Roscommon.
7,181	3 6	24,274	12 1	132,316	65·8	5,993	3·0	38,341	19·1	162,583	80 9	Sligo.
2,201	0 9	48,860	16 2	164,441	64·6	13,805	5·4	27,499	10 8	227,106	89·2	Clare.
8,088	3·4	34,270	14 4	133,905	56·1	28,668	12·0	41,776	17 5	196,843	82·5	Kerry.
131,532	5 4	298,923	12·4	1,329,289	55 0	226,729	9·4	559,732	23 2	1,854,938	76 8	Total.
750,821	11·1	717,671	10·5	3,148,002	46·5	355,886	5 3	2,548,150	37 6	4,221,559	62·4	Total for all Ireland.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

II.—TABLE showing, as regards holdings (*a*) above 50 acres and (*b*) under 50 acres, the number of such per head of cattle; and the number of each kind of cattle, and the percentage the

(*a*).—HOLDINGS

County.	1. Total Number of Holdings.	2. Total Area occupied by these Holdings	3. Total Number of Cattle on these Holdings	4. Number of Acres for each Head of Cattle on these Holdings.	5. Number of Bulls	5. Percentage of Bulls to Total Number of Cattle.
	No	Acres	No	Acres	No	
Donegal	4,651	461,648	58,525	7·9	599	1·0
Galway	4,560	640,408	86,849	7·4	226	0·3
Leitrim,	871	68,260	17,475	3·9	160	0·9
Mayo,	2,953	468,538	55,088	8·5	190	0·3
Roscommon	1,756	207,025	48,766	4·2	120	0·2
Sligo,	1,253	137,912	31,005	4·4	147	0·5
Clare,	4,140	401,999	89,270	4·5	472	0·5
Kerry,	6,342	624,743	149,796	4·2	1,905	1·3
Total,	26,526	3,010,533	536,774	5·6	3,810	0·7
Total for all Ireland,	91,000	9,500,345	2,320,093	4·1	19,326	0·8

(*b*)—HOLDINGS

County	1 Total Number of Holdings	2 Total Area occupied by these Holdings	3 Total Number of Cattle on these Holdings	4 Number of Acres for each Head of Cattle on these Holdings	5 Number of Bulls	5 Percentage of Bulls to Total Number of Cattle
	No	Acres	No	Acres	No	
Donegal,	22,971	387,563	117,288	3·3	321	0·3
Galway,	25,355	426,690	111,442	3·8	226	0·2
Leitrim,	12,214	221,383	77,403	2·9	220	0·3
Mayo,	28,092	434,431	134,877	3·2	237	0·2
Roscommon,	16,426	250,485	84,128	2·9	199	0·2
Sligo,	11,445	200,924	67,064	3·0	157	0·2
Clare,	11,855	254,575	95,577	2·7	296	0·3
Kerry,	10,970	233,619	103,032	2·3	387	0·4
Total,	139,328	2,414,670	790,811	3·0	2,043	0·3
Total for all Ireland,	363,287	6,769,709	2,258,467	3·0	8,202	0·4

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

holdings, the area occupied by these holdings; the number of cattle on these holdings, and the acreage number of each kind of cattle is of the total number of cattle on these holdings

ABOVE 50 ACRES

6.		7		8		9.		
Number of Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf)	Percentage of Milch Cows to Total Number of Cattle	Number of Cattle two years old and upwards.	Percentage of Cattle of this age to Total Number of Cattle.	Number of Cattle over one, and not exceeding two, years old	Percentage of Cattle of this age to Total Number of Cattle.	Number of Cattle under one year old	Percentage of Cattle of this age to Total Number of Cattle	County.
No		No.		No.		No.		
18,815	32-2	11,572	19 8	14,717	25 1	12,831	21-9	Donegal
12,385	14-3	45,850	52 8	20,180	23 2	8,208	9 4	Galway
4,788	27 4	4,651	26 6	4,610	26 4	3,266	18 7	Leitrim.
8,560	15 6	28,659	52-0	12,552	22-9	5,066	9 2	Mayo.
5 945	12 2	28,852	49 0	14,646	30·0	4,203	8 6	Roscommon.
5,312	17 1	11,455	36-9	9,370	32-2	4,121	13-3	Sligo.
22 876	25-6	23,939	26 8	22,922	25 7	19,061	21 4	Clare.
91,027	41-8	20,314	13 6	25,154	16·8	40,496	27-0	Kerry.
140,617	26 2	170,292	31·7	124,781	23 3	97,274	18-1	Total
637,873	27·5	741,433	32-0	491,062	21 2	430,899	18-5	Total for all Ireland.

UNDER 50 ACRES.

6		7.		8		9.		
Number of Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf)	Percentage of Milch Cows to Total Number of Cattle	Number of Cattle two years old and upwards	Percentage of Cattle of this age to Total Number of Cattle.	Number of Cattle over one and under two years old.	Percentage of Cattle of this age to Total Number of Cattle	Number of Cattle under one year old	Percentage of Cattle of this age to Total Number of Cattle.	County.
No.		No.		No.		No.		
47,376	40-4	11,826	10-1	26,323	22 4	31,442	26 8	Donegal
35,794	32 1	20,380	18 3	29,222	26 2	25,820	23 2	Galway.
33 831	43 7	7,322	9-5	12,909	16-7	23,121	29 8	Leitrim.
49,584	36 8	21,350	15 8	31,748	23 5	31,957	23 7	Mayo.
30,494	36 3	6,176	10 9	21,228	25-2	23 031	27 4	Roscommon.
26,993	40-3	6,351	9-5	12,819	19 1	20,744	30 9	Sligo.
35 029	36 6	8,602	9 0	22,343	23 4	29,316	30 7	Clare.
48 436	47 0	6,878	6-7	15,268	14-8	32,060	31 1	Kerry.
397 531	38 9	91,885	11·6	171,861	21 7	217,491	27-5	Total.
879 488	38 9	263,668	11 7	489,910	21-7	617 169	27 3	Total for all Ireland.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV. III.—TABLE showing by certain counties, as regards holdings (*a*) above 50 acres and (*b*) under 50 acres in each county; the percentage the acreage under these holdings is of the total acreage of agricultural total number of each kind

(*a*)—HOLDINGS

County.	1		2.		3.		4.	
	Total Number of Holdings above 50 Acres.	Percentage of Total Number of Holdings.	Total Area of Holdings above 50 Acres.	Percentage of Total Area of Holdings.	Total Number of Cattle on Holdings above 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle.	Total Number of Bulls on Holdings above 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Bulls.
	No		Acres.		No		No.	
Donegal, ...	4,651	16·8	481,648	54·4	58,525	33·3	590	64·8
Galway, ...	4,560	15·2	640,408	60·0	86,849	43·8	226	50·0
Leitrim, ...	871	6·7	68,260	23·6	17,475	18·4	160	42·1
Mayo, ...	2,955	8·5	468,538	51·9	55,088	29·0	190	44·5
Roscommon, ...	1,756	9·7	207,025	45·3	48,766	36·7	120	37·6
Sligo, ...	1,253	9·9	139,912	40·7	31,005	31·6	147	48·4
Clare, ...	4,140	25·9	401,995	61·2	89,270	48·3	472	61·5
Kerry, ...	6,342	36·6	624,743	72·4	149,796	59·2	1,905	83·1
Total, ...	26,528	16·0	3,010,533	55·5	536,774	40·4	3,810	65·1
Total for all Ireland, ..	91,000	20·0	9,500,345	58·4	2,320,093	50·7	19,326	70·2

(*b*).—HOLDINGS

County.	1		2.		3.		4	
	Total Number of Holdings under 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Holdings.	Total Area of Holdings under 50 Acres.	Percentage of Total Area of Holdings.	Total Number of Cattle on Holdings under 50 Acres.	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle	Total Number of Bulls on Holdings under 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Bulls.
	No.		Acres.		No.		No	
Donegal, ...	22,971	83·2	387,563	45·6	117,288	66·7	321	35·2
Galway, ...	25,355	84·8	426,690	40·0	111,442	56·2	226	50·0
Leitrim, ...	12,214	93·3	221,383	76·4	77,403	81·6	220	57·9
Mayo.	28,092	90·5	434,431	48·1	134,877	71·0	287	55·5
Roscommon, ...	16,426	90·3	250,485	54·7	84,128	63·3	199	62·4
Sligo, ...	11,445	90·1	200,924	59·3	67,064	68·4	157	51·8
Clare, ...	11,855	74·1	254,575	38·8	95,577	51·7	296	38·5
Kerry, ...	10,970	63·4	238,619	27·6	103,032	40·8	387	16·9
Total, ...	139,328	84·0	2,414,670	44·5	790,811	59·6	2,043	34·9
Total for all Ireland, ..	363,287	80·0	6,769,709	41·6	2,258,467	49·3	8,202	29·8

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

extent, the percentage that the number of holdings of each class is of the total number of holdings in land in the county; and the percentage the total number of each kind of cattle on these holdings is of the of cattle in county.

ABOVE 50 ACRES.

5.		6.		7.		8		
Total Number of Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf) on Holdings above 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Milch Cows.	Total Number of Cattle of two years old and upwards on Holdings above 50 Acres.	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age.	Total Number of Cattle between one and two years old on Holdings above 50 Acres.	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age.	Total Number of Cattle under one year old on Holdings above 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age.	COUNTY.
No.		No.		No.		No		
18,815	28 4	11,572	49 5	14,717	35-9	12,831	29 0	Donegal.
12,385	25-7	45,850	69-2	20,180	40-8	8,208	24 1	Galway.
4,788	12 4	4,651	38 8	4,610	26 3	3,266	12 4	Leitrim.
8,569	14 7	28,659	57 3	12,582	28 4	5,088	13 7	Mayo.
5,945	16 3	23,852	72-2	14,646	40 8	4,203	15 4	Roscommon.
5,312	16 4	11,455	64 3	9,970	43 7	4,121	16 6	Sligo.
22,876	39-5	23,939	73-6	22,922	50-6	19,051	39 4	Clare.
61,927	56-1	20,314	74-7	25,154	62 2	40,496	55 8	Kerry.
140,617	31 4	170,292	65 0	124,781	42 1	97,274	30 9	Total.
637,873	42 0	741,433	73 8	491,062	50 1	430,399	41-1	Total for all Ireland.

UNDER 50 ACRES

5.		6		7		8.		
Total Number of Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf) on Holdings under 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Milch Cows.	Total Number of Cattle of two years old and upwards on Holdings under 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age.	Total Number of Cattle between one and two years old on Holdings under 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age	Total Number of Cattle under one year old on Holdings under 50 Acres	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age	COUNTY.
No.		No		No		No		
47,376	71 6	11,826	50 5	26,323	64 1	31,442	71 0	Donegal.
35,794	74 3	20,380	30 8	29,222	59-2	25,820	75-9	Galway.
33,831	87 6	7,822	61-2	12,909	73 7	23,121	87 6	Leitrim.
49,584	85·3	21,350	42 7	31,749	71 6	31,957	86-3	Mayo.
30,494	83·7	9,176	27-8	21,228	59 2	23,031	84 6	Roscommon.
26,993	83 6	6,351	35 7	12,819	56-3	20,744	83-4	Sligo.
35,020	60 5	8,502	26 4	22,343	49 4	29,316	60 6	Clare.
48,439	43-6	6,878	25-3	15,268	37 8	32,060	44 2	Kerry.
307,531	68 6	91,885	35 0	171,861	57 3	217,491	69 1	Total
878,488	56 0	263,698	26 2	489,910	49 9	617,169	58 9	Total for all Ireland.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV

IV.—TABLE showing, as regards holdings (*a*) not exceeding 30 acres in extent, (*b*) between 30 acres and 200 acres, various classes of crops on these holdings; and the percentage the area

(*a*.) HOLDINGS UNDER

County	1.	2	3		4.		5		6		7	
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land	Total Area under Corn Crops.	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Green Crops (excluding Potatoes)	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Potatoes	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Flax	Percentage of Total Area	Total Area under Hay, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years	Percentage of Total Area.
	No.	Acres.	Acres		Acres.		Acres		Acres		Acres	
Donegal,	18,908	252,827	35,072	14·2	7,145	2·8	19,367	7·7	1,640	0·6	8,068	3·2
Galway,	21,458	295,038	24,129	8·2	8,052	2·8	20,457	6·8	—	—	11,166	3·8
Leitrim,	10,422	158,118	9,491	5·6	1,687	1·0	8,167	5·2	4	0·0	1,800	1·1
Mayo,	25,073	353,776	29,648	8·3	6,054	1·8	25,736	7·7	23	0·0	14,241	4·3
Roscommon,	14,651	187,001	11,428	6·1	4,261	2·3	12,740	6·8	—	—	5,626	3·0
Sligo,	9,861	146,585	8,094	5·5	2,571	1·7	8,578	5·8	—	—	5,458	3·7
Clare,	8,210	125,999	3,557	3·1	2,588	2·0	6,438	5·1	—	—	1,861	1·5
Kerry,	7,041	112,948	5,223	4·6	2,582	2·2	5,986	5·3	—	—	3,214	2·8
Total,	115,624	1,612,287	123,842	7·7	34,843	2·1	107,469	6·7	1,867	0·1	51,463	3·2
Total for all Ireland,	288,306	4,126,725	468,044	11·3	114,166	2·8	282,802	6·8	27,954	0·7	273,355	6·6

(*b*) HOLDINGS BETWEEN

Donegal,	8,246	431,513	44,756	10·4	11,058	2·6	18,357	3·1	4,518	1·0	12,474	2·6
Galway,	7,443	421,652	14,420	3·4	6,824	1·6	8,902	2·1	—	—	6,165	2·2
Leitrim,	2,024	120,219	2,215	1·8	828	0·7	2,859	2·4	5	0·0	1,140	0·9
Mayo,	5,354	283,431	9,130	3·2	2,804	1·0	6,692	2·3	12	0·0	5,355	1·9
Roscommon,	3,244	191,651	4,401	2·3	2,351	1·2	3,094	1·8	—	—	3,191	1·6
Sligo,	2,680	140,490	4,128	2·6	1,733	1·2	3,287	2·4	1	0·0	3,576	2·0
Clare,	7,303	405,646	6,934	1·7	5,304	1·3	8,223	2·0	—	—	4,075	1·0
Kerry,	6,572	555,405	16,959	3·1	8,363	1·5	13,116	2·4	—	—	11,851	2·1
Total,	46,526	2,553,607	102,946	4·0	39,260	1·5	60,143	2·4	4,536	0·2	50,787	2·0
Total for all Ireland,	156,152	9,056,424	730,381	8·1	243,041	2·7	252,768	2·8	30,833	0·3	481,730	5·3

(*c*) HOLDINGS OVER

Donegal,	468	104,871	2,236	1·4	585	0·3	679	0·4	152	0·1	685	0·4
Galway,	1,014	350,108	2,777	0·8	1,535	0·4	1,188	0·3	—	—	1,627	0·6
Leitrim,	36	11,311	41	0·4	27	0·2	45	0·4	—	—	50	0·4
Mayo,	618	282,762	1,130	0·4	431	0·2	647	0·2	2	0·0	697	0·2
Roscommon,	287	78,508	757	0·9	437	0·6	373	0·5	—	—	576	0·7
Sligo,	157	51,761	587	1·1	206	0·4	305	0·6	—	—	476	0·6
Clare,	422	124,929	1,043	0·8	625	0·5	607	0·5	—	—	801	0·7
Kerry,	666	199,009	1,419	0·7	723	0·4	805	0·5	—	—	617	0·5
Total,	3,704	1,253,309	9,970	0·8	4,569	0·4	4,739	0·4	154	0·0	6,132	0·5
Total for all Ireland,	6,766	3,086,005	69,733	2·3	29,033	0·0	15,265	0·5	655	0·0	52,508	1·7

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

and (c) over 200 acres in extent, the number of such holdings; the area occupied by these holdings; the area occupied by each class of crops is of the total area occupied by these holdings.

30 ACRES.

8		9.		10.		11		12		13		
Pasture under Rotation	Per-centage of Total Area	Permanent Meadow	Per-centage of Total Area	Permanent Pasture	Per centage of Total Area	Mountain land grazed	Per-centage of Total Area	Total of Cols. 3-6 (inclusive)	Per-centage of Total Area	Total of Cols. 9 11 (inclusive)	Per-centage of Total Area.	COUNTY.
Acres.		Acres		Acres		Acres		Acres.		Acres		
29,705	10·6	23,426	9·3	74,413	29·4	55,908	22·2	98,900	39·1	153,637	60·8	Donegal.
16,870	5·7	29,604	10·0	165,056	55·9	19,666	0·7	60,710	27·4	214,628	72·6	Galway.
4,742	3·0	31,874	20·1	101,419	64·1	2,970	1·9	21,850	13·8	166,263	86·2	Leitrim.
27,744	8·3	24,924	7·4	160,613	54·2	24,593	7·4	103,446	31·0	230,330	69·0	Mayo.
7,055	3·8	34,467	16·4	109,417	58·5	2,006	1·1	41,111	22·0	145,990	78·0	Roscommon.
5,281	3·6	16,365	12·5	94,776	64·7	3,464	2·4	20,962	20·5	116,603	79·5	Sligo.
1,063	0·8	26,938	21·4	78,762	62·5	4,502	3·6	15,707	12·5	110,202	67·5	Clare.
3,902	3·5	15,347	13·6	60,736	53·8	16,006	14·2	20,857	16·5	92,091	81·5	Kerry.
93,406	5·8	204,943	12·7	865,366	53·7	129,205	8·0	412,742	25·6	1,169,544	74·4	Total
479,268	11·6	457,357	11·1	1,837,534	44·5	186,185	4·5	1,645,649	39·9	2,481,076	60·1	Total for all Ireland.

30 ACRES AND 200 ACRES.

32,162	12·1	19,606	4·5	104,878	24·3	168,681	39·1	136,353	32·1	263,160	67·9	Donegal.
12,034	3·0	31,476	7·5	254,033	67·4	54,198	12·8	52,245	12·4	369,707	87·6	Galway.
2,738	2·3	18,042	15·9	62,450	68·6	8,944	7·4	9,783	8·1	110,436	91·9	Leitrim.
9,114	3·2	16,524	5·6	172,822	60·5	63,978	22·3	33,107	11·6	253,324	88·4	Mayo.
3,230	1·7	23,758	12·4	148,725	77·5	2,639	1·4	16,832	8·6	175,118	91·2	Roscommon.
3,304	2·4	12,368	8·8	100,504	71·5	11,586	6·2	16,029	11·4	124,401	88·6	Sligo.
2,965	0·7	60,210	14·6	271,608	67·0	46,267	11·5	27,531	6·6	378,115	93·2	Clare.
14,020	2·5	62,035	11·3	323,887	58·3	104,302	18·8	64,351	11·6	491,074	86·4	Kerry.
107,539	3·3	245,919	9·6	1,488,852	58·4	460,625	16·0	356,211	14·0	2,165,366	86·0	Total
587,015	8·5	803,285	8·9	4,935,562	54·5	821,197	9·1	2,406,380	27·5	6,560,044	72·4	Total for all Ireland.

200 ACRES.

9,149	1·3	1,849	1·1	22,934	13·0	133,605	81·1	6,463	3·9	158,386	96·1	Donegal.
2,836	0·8	11,805	3·4	177,507	50·7	150,530	43·0	10,266	2·6	339,842	97·1	Galway.
307	2·7	537	4·7	5,728	50·7	4,576	40·5	470	4·1	10,641	95·9	Leitrim.
868	0·3	3,520	1·2	73,760	26·1	201,767	71·4	3,715	1·5	276,047	98·7	Mayo.
183	0·2	6,725	8·6	69,072	87·9	455	0·6	2,306	2·9	76,252	97·1	Roscommon.
354	0·7	1,403	2·7	26,431	51·1	21,696	42·0	1,931	3·7	49,630	96·3	Sligo.
468	0·4	7,629	6·3	80,870	64·7	32,556	26·1	3,574	2·6	121,355	97·1	Clare.
1,230	0·6	7,020	3·6	66,512	35·1	114,284	58·6	5,193	2·7	189,616	97·3	Kerry.
5,374	0·6	40,788	3·2	524,814	41·7	659,769	52·4	38,936	2·7	1,225,371	97·3	Total.
64,732	2·1	150,067	4·9	1,647,541	53·4	1,057,338	34·2	231,959	7·5	2,654,946	92·5	Total for all Ireland

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV. V.—TABLE showing, as regards holdings (*a*) under 30 acres in extent, (*b*) between 30 acres and 200 acres, and of cattle on these holdings, and the acreage per head of cattle; and the number of each kind of cattle,

(*a.*)—HOLDINGS NOT

COUNTY.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
	Number of Holdings.	Total Area occupied by these Holdings.	Total Number of Cattle on these Holdings	Number of Acres for each Head of Cattle on these Holdings	Number of Bulls.	Percentage to Total Number of Animals
	No.	Acres.	No.	Acres	No.	
Donegal,	18,908	252,827	64,441	3·0	163	0·2
Galway,	21,458	295,058	83,635	3·5	154	0·2
Leitrim,	10,242	158,113	57,621	2·7	113	0·2
Mayo,	25,073	333,776	109,820	3·0	137	0·1
Roscommon,	14,651	187,001	66,538	2·8	116	0·2
Sligo,	9,861	146,535	50,380	2·9	89	0·2
Clare,	8,210	125,999	52,476	2·4	60	0·1
Kerry,	7,041	112,948	48,770	2·3	118	0·3
Total,	115,624	1,612,287	553,681	2·9	950	0·2
Total for all Ireland,	288,366	4,126,725	1,428,367	2·9	3,562	0·2

(*b.*)—HOLDINGS OVER 30 ACRES

Donegal,	8,246	431,513	84,014	5·1	672	0·6
Galway,	7,443	421,952	78,956	5·3	212	0·3
Leitrim,	2,624	120,219	36,101	3·3	257	0·7
Mayo,	5,354	286,431	60,494	4·7	241	0·4
Roscommon,	3,244	191,951	49,970	3·8	166	0·3
Sligo,	2,680	140,490	40,325	3·5	178	0·4
Clare,	7,363	405,646	115,149	3·5	618	0·5
Kerry,	9,572	555,405	180,592	3·1	1,811	1·0
Total,	46,526	2,553,607	646,201	4·0	4,155	0·6
Total for all Ireland,	156,152	9,056,424	2,618,345	3·5	20,747	0·8

(*c.*)—HOLDINGS

Donegal,	468	164,871	6,758	24·4	76	1·1
Galway,	1,014	350,108	35,700	9·8	86	0·2
Leitrim,	39	11,311	1,156	9·8	10	0·8
Mayo,	618	282,762	19,651	14·4	49	0·2
Roscommon,	287	78,558	16,386	4·8	37	0·2
Sligo,	157	51,761	7,364	7·0	37	0·5
Clare,	422	124,929	17,222	7·2	90	0·5
Kerry,	699	195,009	23,466	8·3	363	1·5
Total,	3,704	1,259,309	127,703	9·9	748	0·6
Total for all Ireland,	9,769	3,086,605	531,548	5·8	3,219	0·8

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

(c) over 200 acres in extent, the number of such holdings, the area occupied by these holdings, the number and the percentage the number of each kind of cattle is of the total number of cattle on these holdings. APPENDIX IV

EXCEEDING 30 ACRES

6		7		8.		9		
Number of Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf)	Percentage to Total Number of Animals	Number of Cattle of two years old and upwards	Percentage to Total Number of Animals	Number of Cattle over one year and not exceeding two years	Percentage to Total Number of Animals.	Number of Cattle under one year	Percentage to Total Number of Animals.	COUNTY.
No		No.		No.		No.		
35,301	41-8	7,538	8 9	18,241	21 6	23,198	27 5	Donegal
28,601	34 2	12,807	15 3	21,266	25 4	20,807	24 9	Galway
20,005	45-1	4,807	8 3	9,145	15 9	17,553	30 5	Leitrim.
42,281	36 5	14,954	13-0	25,263	23 0	27,185	24 8	Mayo.
25,580	38 4	5,668	8 5	15,890	23-9	19,274	29 0	Roscommon.
21,391	42-4	3,725	7 4	8,755	17·4	16,420	32-6	Sligo.
19 572	37 3	4,158	7 9	12,332	23-5	16,354	31 2	Clare
23,027	47-2	3,071	6 3	7,420	15-2	15,134	31-0	Kerry.
221,763	40-5	56,728	10 2	118,310	21 2	155,925	27-9	Total.
571,549	40 0	145,254	10-2	308,528	21-6	399,474	28 0	Total for all Ireland.

BUT NOT EXCEEDING 200 ACRES

29,053	34-8	13,777	16-3	21,134	25 0	19,978	23 6	Donegal
15,359	19-5	32,149	40 7	20,701	26 2	10,535	13 3	Galway.
12,401	34 4	6,664	18-5	8,069	22 3	8,710	24 1	Leitrim.
13,775	22 8	22,984	38-0	14,981	24-7	8,513	14 1	Mayo
9,486	19·0	17,718	35 5	15,630	31 3	6,970	13-9	Roscommon.
9,900	24 8	11,132	27 6	11,362	28-2	7,683	19 0	Sligo
35,797	31 0	19,957	17 5	28,703	24 9	30,074	26-1	Clare.
79,900	44 3	17,947	9 9	28,208	15 6	52,726	29 2	Kerry.
205,781	31 9	142,328	22 0	148,788	23 0	145,189	22 5	Total.
361,021	32 9	574,252	21-9	567,304	21 7	595 021	22-7	Total for all Ireland.

ABOVE 200 ACRES.

1,537	27 2	2,083	30-8	1,665	24 6	1,097	16·3	Donegal.
4 219	11-8	21,274	59-5	7,435	20-9	2,686	7-6	Galway.
213	18 4	502	43 5	307	26 5	124	10 8	Leitrim
2 097	10 7	12,071	61 5	4,087	20-8	1,347	6 8	Mayo.
1,563	8 4	9,642	58-8	4,394	26 5	990	6 0	Roscommon.
924	12 6	2,949	40-0	2,072	36 3	782	10 6	Sligo.
2,527	14 7	8,426	49 0	4,230	24 5	1,949	11 3	Clare
7,439	31 7	6,174	26 3	4,794	20 4	4,690	20 1	Kerry.
20,919	19 1	63,121	49 4	29,544	23 2	13 671	10 7	Total.
34,791	16 1	285,625	53 6	105,140	19-8	53,073	9 9	Total for all Ireland.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

VI.—STATEMENT showing, by certain counties, as regards holdings (*a*) under 30 acres, (*b*) between 30 acres number of holdings in each county; the percentage the acreage under these holdings is of the total these holdings is of the total number

(*a*) HOLDINGS NOT

County	1		2		3		4	
	Total Number of these Holdings.	Percentage of Total Number of Holdings	Total Area of these Holdings	Percentage of Total Area of Holdings	Total Number of Cattle on these Holdings	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle.	Total Number of Bulls on these Holdings	Percentage of Total Number of Bulls
	No		Acres		No		No	
Donegal,	18,908	86 5	252,827	29 8	84,441	46 1	163	17 8
Galway,	21,458	71 7	295,036	27 7	83,835	42 3	154	34 1
Leitrim,	10,422	79 6	158,113	54 6	57,621	60·7	115	29 7
Mayo,	25,073	80 8	333,776	37·0	109,820	57·9	137	32 1
Roscommon,	14,851	80 8	187,001	40 8	66,538	50 0	118	36 4
Sligo,	9,861	77 7	146,585	43 3	50,380	51 4	89	29 3
Clare,	8,210	51 3	125,999	19 2	52,476	28 4	50	7 8
Kerry,	7,041	40 6	112,948	13 1	48,770	19 4	118	5 1
Total,	115,624	69 7	1,612,287	29 7	553,681	41 7	650	16 2
Total for all Ireland,	288,366	63 4	4,126,725	25 4	1,428,367	31 2	3,562	12 8

(*b*) HOLDINGS EXCEEDING 30 ACRES,

Donegal,	8,246	29 8	431,513	50 8	84,614	48 1	672	73 6
Galway,	7,443	24 9	421,952	39 5	78,956	39 8	212	46 6
Leitrim,	2,624	20 1	120,219	41 5	36,101	38 1	207	67 7
Mayo,	5,354	17 2	286,431	31 7	80,494	31 8	241	56 4
Roscommon,	3,244	17 8	191,951	42 0	49,970	37 6	166	52 0
Sligo,	2,680	21 1	140,490	41 4	40,325	41 1	178	58 5
Clare,	7,363	46 0	405,648	61 8	115,149	62 3	618	80 5
Kerry,	9,572	55 4	555 405	64 3	180,592	71 4	1,811	79·0
Total,	46,526	26 1	2,553,607	47 1	846,201	48 7	4,155	71 0
Total for all Ireland,	136,152	34 4	9,056,424	55 6	2,618,345	57 2	20,747	75 4

(*c*) HOLDINGS EXCEEDING

Donegal,	No 468	1 7	Acres 164,871	19 4	8,758	3 8	76	8 4
Galway,	1,014	3 4	350,108	32 8	35,700	17·9	86	19 0
Leitrim,	39	0 3	11,311	3 9	1,156	1 2	10	2 8
Mayo,	618	2 0	282,762	31 3	19,651	10 8	49	11 5
Roscommon,	287	1·8	78,558	17 2	16,386	12 4	37	11 6
Sligo,	157	1 2	51,761	15 3	7,364	7 5	37	12 2
Clare,	422	2 7	124,923	19 0	17,222	9 3	90	11·7
Kerry,	669	4·0	165,009	22 8	23,466	9 2	363	15 8
Total,	3,704	2·2	1,259,309	23 2	127,703	4 8	748	12 8
Total for all Ireland,	9,769	2 2	3,086,905	19 0	531,848	11 6	3,216	11 7

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

and 200 acres, and over 200 acres in extent, the percentage that the number of holdings of each class is of the total acreage of agricultural land in the county; and the percentage the total number of each kind of cattle on of each kind of cattle in the county.

EXCEEDING 30 ACRES.

5		6		7		8.		
Total Number of Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf) on these Holdings	Percentage of Total Number of Milch Cows	Total Number of Cattle of two years old and upwards on these Holdings.	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age.	Total Number of Cattle over one and not exceeding two years old on these Holdings	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age.	Total Number of Cattle under one year old on these Holdings	Percentage of Total Number of Cattle of this age.	COUNTY
No. 35,391	53 3	No. 7,538	32 3	No. 18,241	44 5	No. 23,198	52 4	Donegal.
28,601	59 4	12,807	19 2	21,286	43 0	20,807	81 2	Galway.
26,005	67 3	4,807	40 6	9,145	52 2	17,553	86 5	Leitrim.
42,281	72 7	14,054	26 9	25,263	57 0	27,185	73 2	Mayo.
26,990	70 3	5,888	17 1	15,890	44 3	19,274	70 8	Roscommon.
21,391	66 2	3,725	20 0	8,755	38 5	16,420	86 1	Sligo
19,572	33 8	4,158	12 7	12,332	27 2	16,654	33 8	Clare.
26,027	20 9	3,071	11·2	7,420	18 4	15,134	20 8	Kerry.
221,768	49 5	56,728	21 6	118,610	40·4	155,925	49 5	Total.
571,549	37 7	145,254	14 3	308,528	31 5	399,474	38 1	Total for all Ireland.

BUT NOT EXCEEDING 200 ACRES.

29,953	43 9	13,777	59 0	21,154	51 4	19,978	45 1	Donegal
15,350	31 9	32,149	48 7	20,701	41 9	10,555	30 9	Galway.
12,401	32 2	6,884	55 2	8,069	46 0	8,710	33 0	Leitrim.
13,775	23 7	22,984	46 0	14,981	33 8	8,513	23 0	Mayo.
9,486	26 0	17,718	53 7	15,630	43 8	8,970	25 6	Roscommon
9,990	31 0	11,132	62 5	11,362	49 8	7,663	30 8	Sligo
35,797	81 8	19,957	81 4	28,703	63 4	30,074	62 2	Clare
79,900	72 4	17,947	66 0	28,208	89 7	52,726	72 8	Kerry
205,761	45 9	142,328	54 3	144,788	49 5	145,189	46 1	Total
561,021	58 7	574,252	57 3	567,304	57·8	595,021	56 8	Total for all Ireland.

200 ACRES IN EXTENT

1,837	2 8	2,083	8 7	1,885	4 1	1,097	2 5	Donegal
4,219	8 7	21,274	32 1	7,435	15 1	2,686	7·9	Galway.
213	0 5	502	4 2	307	1 8	124	0 5	Leitrim
2,037	3 6	12,071	24 1	4,087	9 2	1,347	3 7	Mayo.
1,163	3 7	9,842	29 2	4,354	12 1	990	3 6	Roscommon.
924	2 8	2,949	16 6	2,072	11 7	782	3·1	Sligo
2,927	4 4	8,426	25 9	4,230	9 4	1,949	4 6	Clare
7,439	6 7	6,174	22 8	4,794	11 6	4,896	6 4	Kerry
20,619	4 6	63,121	24 1	29,544	10 1	13,871	4 4	Total
84,791	5 6	258,625	28 4	105,140	10 7	53,073	5 1	Total for all Ireland

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

VII.—TABLE showing, for holdings under 50 acres and over 50 acres in the whole of Connaught and the counties of Donegal, Clare, and Kerry, the number of holdings, the area of agricultural land occupied by these holdings, the area occupied by various classes of crops on these holdings, and the percentage the area occupied by each crop on each class of holding is of the area occupied by both classes of holdings.

HOLDINGS.	1.	2.	3.		4		5.		6.		7		8		9		10.		11.		12		13.	
	No. of Holdings	Total area of agricultural land occupied by these Holdings	Total area under Corn Crops	Percentage of total area.	Total area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Percentage of total area	Total area under Potatoes	Percentage of total area	Total area under Flax	Percentage of total area.	Total area under Hay 1st 2nd, and 3rd years	Percentage of total area.	Pasture under Rotation	Percentage of total area.	Permanent Meadow	Percentage of total area	Permanent Pasture	Percentage of total area	Mountain land Grazed.	Percentage of total area	Totals of Cols. 3-8 (excluding Potatoes, Cols.)	Percentage of total area	Totals of Cols. 9-11 (inclusive).	Percentage of total area
	No.	Acres.	Acres		Acres.		Acres		Acres		Acres.		Acres.		Acres		Acres.		Acres.		Acres		Acres	
Under 50 Acres, .	139,328	2,414,670	166, 80	6·9	137 304	7·6	136 528	5·6	3,023	0·1	71,693	3·0	131,532	5·4	296,923	12·4	1,320,289	55·0	226,726	9·4	5o9 732	23·2	1,854,938	76·8
Over 50 Acres, .	26,526	3 010,533	70 578	2·3	63 719	2·1	35,823	1·2	3,334	0·1	36,689	1·2	70 840	2·4	192,727	6·4	1,519,773	51·5	1,022 873	34·0	215,160	8·1	2,765 873	91·9

VIII.—TABLE showing, for holdings under and over 50 acres in the whole of Connaught and the counties of Donegal, Clare, and Kerry, the number of holdings, the total area occupied by these holdings, the total number of cattle on these holdings, and the acreage per head of cattle, and the number of each kind of cattle, and the percentage that the number of each kind of cattle on each class of holding is of the number of cattle on each of the two classes of holdings.

HOLDINGS.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		6		7		8		9	
	No of Holdings	Total area of agricultural land occupied by these Holdings.	Total number of cattle on these Holdings	No of acres for each head of Cattle	No of Bulls	Percentage of Bulls to total number of Cattle.	No of Milch cows (including Heifers in calf)	Percentage of Milch cows to total number of Cattle.	No of Cattle two years old and upwards.	Percentage of Cattle of this age to total number of Cattle.	No of Cattle over one and under two years old	Percentage of Cattle of this age to total number of Cattle	No of Cattle under one year old.	Percentage of Cattle of this age to total number of Cattle
	No.	Acres	No	Acres.	No.		No.		No		No		No	
Under 50 Acres, . .	139,328	2,414,670	790,811	3·0	2,043	0·3	307,531	38·9	91 885	11·6	171 861	21·7	217 491	27·5
Over 50 Acres, . . .	26,526	3,010,533	536,774	5·6	3 810	0·7	140 617	26·2	170 292	31·7	124,781	23·3	97 274	18·1

IX.—TABLE showing, for holdings under and over 50 acres in the whole of Connaught and the counties of Donegal, Clare, and Kerry, the number of holdings of each of the two classes and the percentage that number is of the number of both classes of holdings, the area occupied by each class of holdings and the percentage that area is of the total area of both classes of holdings, the total number of cattle and of the various classes of cattle on the holdings, and the percentage these numbers are of the total numbers on both classes of holdings.

HOLDINGS.	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
	No of Holdings,	Percentage of total number of Holdings	Total area of agricultural land occupied by these Holdings.	Percentage of total area of Holdings	Total number of Cattle on these Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Cattle.	Total number of Bulls on these Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Bulls	Total number of Milch cows (including Heifers in Calf) on Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Milch cows	Total number of Cattle of two years old and upwards on Holdings	Percentage of total number of Cattle of this age.	Total number of Cattle between one and two years old on these Holdings	Percentage of total number of Cattle of this age	Total number of Cattle under one year old on Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Cattle of this age.
	No.		Acres.		No		No		No.		No		No.		No.	
Under 50 Acres. .	139,328	84·0	2 414 670	44 5	790,811	59·6	2,043	34·9	307,531	68·6	91,885	35·0	171,861	57·9	217,491	69·1
Over 50 Acres, .	26,526	16·0	3,010,533	55·5	536,774	40·4	3,810	65·1	140 617	31·4	170,292	65·0	124,781	42·1	97,274	30·9

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

X.—TABLE showing, for holdings under 30 acres, from 30 to 200 acres, and over 200 acres in the whole of Connaught and the counties of Donegal, Clare, and Kerry, the number of holdings, the area of agricultural land occupied by these holdings, the area occupied by various classes of crops on these holdings, and the percentage the area occupied by each crop on each class of holding is of the area occupied by each of the three classes of holdings.

HOLDINGS.	1.	2	3.		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12		13.	
	No of Holdings.	Total area of agricultural land	Total area under Corn Crops	Percentage of total area.	Total area under Green Crops (excluding Potatoes)	Percentage of total area.	Total area under Potatoes.	Percentage of total area	Total area under Flax	Percentage of total area.	Total area under Hay 1st 2nd and 3rd years	Percentage of total area	Pasture under Rotation	Percentage of total area	Permanent Meadow	Percentage of total area	Permanent Pasture	Percentage of total area.	Mountain land Grazed.	Percentage of total area.	Totals of Cols 3-5 (inclusive)	Percentage of total area	Totals of Cols. 9-11 (inclusive)	Percentage of total area.
	No	Acres.	Acres.		Acres.		Acres		Acres.		Acres.		Acres		Acres		Acres.		Acres.		Acres		Acres	
Under 30 Acres	115 624	1 612,287	123 842	7 7	34,843	2 1	107,469	6 7	1,067	0·1	51,463	3·2	93 459	5 8	204 913	12·7	865 396	53·7	129,205	8 0	412 743	25 6	1,199 544	74 4
From 30 to 200 Acres	46 526	2 563,607	102,946	4·0	30 260	1 5	60,143	2 4	4 336	0·2	50,787	2 0	100,539	3 9	245 919	9 6	1,433,852	58 4	460 685	18·0	358,211	14 0	2,195 396	86 0
Over 200 Acres, .	3,704	1,259,309	9 970	0·8	4,569	0 4	4,759	0·4	154	0 0	6,132	0·5	8,371	0 6	40 788	3 2	521 814	41·7	659,769	52 4	43,938	2 7	1,225,371	97 3

XI.—TABLE showing, for holdings under 30 acres, from 30 to 200 acres, and over 200 acres in the whole of Connaught and the counties of Donegal, Clare, and Kerry, the number of holdings, the total area occupied by these holdings, the total number of cattle on these holdings, and the acreage per head of cattle, and the number of each kind of cattle, and the percentage that the number of each kind of cattle on each class of holding is of the number of cattle on each of the three classes of holdings.

DIVISIONS OF LAND.	1	2.	3	4.	5		6		7		8		9	
	Total No of Holdings	Total area of agricultural land occupied by these Holdings	Total number of cattle on these Holdings	No of acres for each head of Cattle on these Holdings.	No. of Bulls on these Holdings	Percentage of Bulls to total number of Animals.	No of Milch cows (including Heifers in calf)	Percentage of Milch cows to total number of Animals	No of Cattle of two years old and upwards on these Holdings	Percentage of total number of this age to total number of Animals.	No of Cattle over one and under two years old	Percentage of total number of this age to total number of Animals.	No of Cattle under one year old	Percentage of total number of Cattle of this age to total number of Animals.
	No.	Acres	No	Acres.	No		No		No		No		No	
Under 30 Acres, . . .	115 624	1,612,287	553,681	2 9	950	0 2	221,768	40 5	56,728	10 2	118,310	21 2	155,925	27 9
From 30 to 200 Acres,	46,526	2,563,607	646,401	4 0	4,155	0·6	205 761	31·9	142 328	22 0	148,788	23 0	145,169	22·5
Over 200 Acres, . . .	3 704	1,259,309	127,703	9·9	748	0 6	20,619	16·1	63,121	49·4	29,544	23 2	13,671	10 7

XII.—TABLE showing, for holdings under 30 acres, from 30 to 200 acres, and over 200 acres in the whole of Connaught and the counties of Donegal, Clare, and Kerry, the number of holdings of each of the three classes and the percentage that number is of the number of the three classes of holdings, the area occupied by each class of holdings and the percentage that area is of the total area of the three classes of holdings, the total number of cattle and of the various classes of cattle on these holdings, and the percentages these numbers are of the total numbers on the three classes of holdings.

HOLDINGS	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8.	
	Total No. of Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Holdings.	Total area of Holdings	Percentage of total area of Holdings.	Total number of Cattle on Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Cattle	Total number of Bulls on Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Bulls.	Total number of Milch cows (including Heifers in Calf) on Holdings	Percentage of total number of Milch cows	Total number of Cattle of two years old and upwards on Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Cattle of this age	Total number of Cattle between one and two years old on Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Cattle of this age.	Total number of Cattle under one year old on Holdings.	Percentage of total number of Cattle of this age
	No.		Acres.		No		No.		No		No		No.		No	
Under 30 Acres, .	115 624	69 7	1,612,287	29 7	553 681	41·7	950	16 2	221,768	49·5	56,748	21 6	118,310	40 4	155,925	49·5
From 30 to 200 Acres.	46 526	28 1	2,563,607	47 1	646,401	48·7	4,155	71 0	205,761	45 9	142 328	54·3	144,788	49 5	145,169	46·1
Over 200 Acres, .	3,704	2·2	1,259 309	23 2	127,703	9 6	748	12 8	20,619	4 6	63,121	24 1	29,544	10 1	13,671	4 4

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XIII.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Extent under Crops and Grass in each Class.

Counties	HOLDINGS. Above 200 Statute Acres.											
							Hay.			Pasture		
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land	Total Area under Corn Crops.	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes).	Potatoes.	Flax.	1st Years.	2nd and 3rd Years.	Permanent Meadow.	Under Rotation.	Permanent	Mountain Land Grazed.
	No	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres.
Leinster.												
Carlow,	116	32 542	2 666	1,222	347	—	1,145	1,013	2,752	1,298	21 996	460
Dublin,	140	39,673	1,057	262	257	—	490	640	3,783	414	30,456	2,462
Kildare	389	124 747	5,315	2,541	443	—	1,931	1,799	8.107	1,144	103,806	101
Kilkenny,	228	61,650	3,057	1,492	400	—	1,091	953	4,434	1,740	46,647	2,227
King's,	308	83,849	2,428	1,628	439	—	1,076	1,179	5,641	1.111	67,134	3,652
Longford,	78	18,910	200	178	86	—	41	76	1 835	163	16,423	—
Louth,	130	36 451	3,120	1 576	491	2	1,126	1,055	1,972	2,708	22,446	7 446
Meath,	655	210,470	3,132	2,151	756	—	1,212	1 479	15 092	1,506	185 876	12
Queen's	284	78 209	3,805	2,198	523	—	1,302	1,476	5,713	1,069	54,450	8,196
Westmeath,	328	101,293	919	885	311	—	415	554	6 639	729	91,053	99
Wexford,	206	53,628	5,310	2,472	498	—	2,203	1,317	1,179	6,570	30,843	3,734
Wicklow,	362	142,224	3,580	2,353	474	—	1,752	2,302	3 228	4,037	97,171	67 801
Munster.												
Clare,	422	124,929	1 043	1,232	607	—	330	471	7 929	498	80,370	32,556
Cork,	817	200 141	9,025	6,039	1,751	—	4,523	3,518	10,473	13,121	100,501	58 941
Kerry,	699	195,009	1 419	1,613	895	—	336	531	7,020	1,239	68 512	114,284
Limerick,	262	76,444	793	839	390	—	266	249	10,763	310	51,302	11,922
Tipperary,	620	183,011	4,699	3,400	924	3	1,377	1,410	15,540	1,818	121,882	32,582
Waterford,	253	75,683	3,039	1,500	365	—	1 243	808	1,146	3 586	37,010	27 351
Ulster												
Antrim,	210	89 255	1,320	844	474	147	636	566	3,455	2,263	26,569	52,808
Armagh,	20	4,718	174	84	34	13	185	56	430	247	1,992	1,557
Cavan,	75	15 411	219	174	143	5	118	97	1,209	935	7,709	4,885
Donegal,	468	164,871	2,236	1,264	679	102	572	113	1,849	2,146	22,934	133,605
Down,	104	34,920	1,662	936	353	121	833	364	648	3 475	9,242	17,641
Fermanagh,	89	24,010	211	172	94	6	93	98	2,151	195	13,048	8,836
Londonderry,	176	61 553	2,352	1,238	567	143	1,075	112	326	5,030	11,866	38 905
Monaghan,	25	5,822	285	105	39	—	113	68	580	288	3,946	435
Tyrone,	190	67 036	1,400	730	394	61	453	197	1,635	1,986	9 302	51,272
Connaught.												
Galway,	1,014	350,108	2,777	2.723	1,188	—	975	952	11,805	2,839	177,507	150,570
Leitrim,	39	11,311	41	72	45	—	14	30	537	307	5,728	4 576
Mayo,	618	282,762	1,130	1,078	647	2	345	352	3,520	803	73,780	201.767
Roscommon,	287	78 558	737	810	373	—	251	325	6,725	183	69.072	455
Sligo,	157	51,761	587	511	305	—	236	243	1,403	354	23 431	21,996
Summary												
Leinster,	3,224	983 542	34,589	18,955	5,025	2	13,784	13,652	60,376	22,498	728.301	91,183
Munster,	3,073	861,217	20,013	14,628	4,932	3	8,425	6,987	52,871	20,572	460,077	277,636
Ulster,	1,357	467,646	9,859	5,548	2,730	648	4,058	1 671	12,831	17,171	106,665	309,196
Connaught,	2,115	774 500	5,272	5,194	2 558	2	1 821	1,908	23 990	4,491	359,493	379,374
Total of Ireland,	9769	3 086,905	69,738	44 328	15,295	885	28.088	24,418	150 067	64 732	1,647,541	1,057 338

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

XIII.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Extent under Crops and Grass in each Class—*continued.*

Counties.	HOLDINGS Above 100 and not exceeding 200 Statute Acres											
	Number of Holdings.	Total Area of Agricultural Land.	Total Area under Corn Crops	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Potatoes.	Flax.	Hay. 1st Year's	Hay. 2nd and 3rd Years'	Hay. Permanent Meadow.	Pasture. Under Rotation	Pasture. Permanent.	Mountain Land Grazed
	No.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres.
Leinster.												
Carlow,	353	44,772	4,834	2,446	878	—	2,036	1,633	5 540	2,157	27,500	626
Dublin,	399	53,903	3,695	2,041	1,137	—	1,371	1,906	6 718	868	36,516	788
Kildare,	735	83,497	7 623	3,825	885	—	3,126	3,057	8,514	1,822	55,448	82
Kilkenny,	822	101,977	7 993	3,989	1,387	—	3,060	2,223	7,922	5,360	69,009	2,430
King's,	578	71,069	4,680	3 082	1,062	—	1,849	1,785	6,129	1 472	51,421	851
Longford	195	23,573	392	374	219	—	162	162	3,653	150	18,671	—
Louth,	229	28,644	4 109	2,161	771	3	1,617	1,094	1,298	3,533	13,861	668
Meath,	921	130,096	3,127	1,953	740	—	1,540	1,761	11,952	3,874	105,860	29
Queen's,	606	76,929	7,041	4,039	1,258	—	2 481	2,948	7,844	1,824	49,173	1 579
Westmeath,	548	68,563	1,164	1,039	431	—	486	632	6,217	603	58,062	160
Wexford,	871	105,939	15 671	7,234	1,952	—	5,864	2,709	2,242	13,336	54,024	1,809
Wicklow,	719	90,342	4,530	2,999	1,057	—	2,339	3,579	5,541	4,037	57,360	9 157
Munster.												
Clare	927	108,278	1,200	1 951	1,085	—	367	378	12,925	540	73,099	17,798
Cork,	3,380	394,186	29,946	19,846	0,627	15	14,556	9,581	26,006	41,624	213,460	39,152
Kerry	1,702	193,690	3,816	4,724	2,702	—	1,290	1,649	16,786	3,694	104,312	57,419
Limerick,	1,039	129,185	1,744	2 359	1,312	—	711	794	23,753	2,196	93,116	4 512
Tipperary,	1,481	182,853	10,390	7,234	2,293	—	3,902	3,289	19,113	4,597	127,713	6,606
Waterford,	812	97,588	8 249	4,224	1 313	—	3,443	1,319	981	10,682	01,370	7 314
Ulster.												
Antrim,	524	64,136	4,419	2 796	1,803	603	2,511	1,551	4,561	7,533	25 300	14,859
Armagh,	99	11,438	759	436	214	93	495	429	1,711	1,731	5,276	503
Cavan,	224	25 240	944	649	408	41	444	465	3,073	1,881	16,347	1,391
Donegal.	1,031	113,420	9,654	4,661	2,102	1,089	2,686	343	3,008	12,421	25,308	54,245
Down,	334	39,447	6,047	3,667	2,083	389	2,827	1,671	1,137	11,512	10,109	2,033
Fermanagh,	353	40,804	802	690	439	12	247	234	5,399	895	26,053	6,471
Londonderry,	435	49,920	7,142	3,545	1,681	671	2,576	588	1,336	11,936	10 237	12,059
Monaghan,	109	12,224	831	370	172	64	372	399	945	1,600	7,245	393
Tyrone,	581	66,207	5,472	2,925	1,459	613	1,836	643	3,125	8,511	13,842	24,232
Connaught												
Galway,	1,214	146,356	2,454	2,509	1,215	—	942	981	6214	3,037	104,109	24,110
Leitrim,	166	16,158	193	267	193	—	37	98	2,285	186	10,467	2,625
Mayo,	723	87,937	1,262	1,329	855	1	283	407	3,391	1,035	53,040	26,589
Roscommon,	532	69,093	806	984	589	—	295	478	7,008	795	55,012	717
Sligo,	314	38,002	686	831	460	—	350	276	2,421	474	27,148	5,313
Summary.												
Leinster,	6,976	879,104	65,159	35,232	11,830	3	25,731	23,483	71,570	42,345	587,396	18,179
Munster,	9,341	1,105,780	55,351	40 336	15 337	15	24 289	17 010	99,567	63,333	373,076	132,801
Ulster,	3,690	422,836	36 070	19,639	10,270	3,575	13,994	6,333	24,353	58 021	144,747	116,201
Connaught,	2,949	357,540	5,401	5 920	3,312	1	1 907	2,240	23,617	5 527	252,773	60,157
Total of Ireland,	22,956	2,765,266	161 981	101,029	40 749	3 597	65,921	49 072	219 107	169,226	1,667,995	327 338

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XIII.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Extent under Crops and Grass in each Class—*continued.*

COUNTIES.	HOLDINGS											
	Above 50 and not exceeding 100 Statute Acres											
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land.	Total Area under Corn Crops	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes).	Potatoes.	Flax.	Hay. 1st Year's	Hay. 2nd and 3rd Years'	Hay. Permanent Meadow.	Pasture. Under Rotation.	Pasture. Permanent.	Mountain Land Grazed
LEINSTER.	No	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres
Carlow, ...	846	55,122	8,208	4,638	2,102	—	3,424	2,745	3,982	3,836	27,806	583
Dublin, ...	625	41,032	3,736	2,697	1,442	—	1,505	2,046	6,775	730	23,379	164
Kildare, ...	956	65,465	6,753	3,623	1,040	—	2,720	2,864	5,666	1,745	41,895	199
Kilkenny, ...	2,119	133,919	15,456	7,795	3,106	—	5,873	3,603	9,519	8,398	80,585	2,212
King's	1,239	78,536	8,581	5,464	2,360	—	2,522	2,903	7,023	1,219	50,279	676
Longford, ...	607	39,244	1,302	1,474	863	1	529	503	6,028	305	28,520	72
Louth, ...	467	31,393	5,994	2,837	1,077	5	2,186	1,374	1,183	3,900	13,722	192
Meath, ...	1,215	80,931	3,930	2,462	1,090	—	1,870	1,961	9,465	2,722	58,480	38
Queen's, ...	1,266	80,177	10,384	6,509	2,523	—	3,532	3,977	8,462	2,426	44,323	531
Westmeath, ...	1,065	69,456	2,655	2,248	1,140	—	1,068	1,255	7,638	866	53,640	96
Wexford, ...	2,509	160,713	28,207	13,677	4,803	—	10,550	4,937	4,312	25,125	71,855	2,059
Wicklow, ...	1,395	90,211	6,322	4,081	1,836	—	3,033	4,579	6,515	4,680	52,942	3,034
MUNSTER.												
Clare, ...	2,791	168,792	2,363	5,442	3,256	—	823	958	25,363	1,317	112,830	19,196
Cork, ...	8,057	503,850	44,619	33,317	13,202	40	22,012	13,014	33,590	57,629	260,575	39,241
Kerry, ...	3,941	236,044	7,563	9,135	5,594	—	2,565	2,817	27,226	6,159	146,358	38,221
Limerick, ...	2,936	190,104	4,098	5,501	3,102	—	1,600	1,490	36,821	1,934	134,248	4,112
Tipperary, ...	3,533	225,537	16,870	12,520	5,302	—	6,011	5,280	25,994	7,513	147,453	4,196
Waterford, ...	1,676	103,588	11,013	6,149	2,433	—	4,406	1,607	912	12,704	61,013	8,181
ULSTER.												
Antrim, ...	2,372	155,556	16,397	11,008	7,351	2,770	8,537	4,615	13,075	25,202	52,444	21,199
Armagh, ...	567	33,675	4,261	2,387	1,285	627	2,324	1,527	3,956	5,899	12,025	905
Cavan, ...	933	58,043	3,198	2,416	1,719	177	1,604	1,099	7,253	4,887	35,597	1,482
Donegal, ...	3,152	183,357	19,098	10,302	5,424	2,083	4,663	559	8,353	23,061	43,716	71,522
Down	1,864	110,526	22,891	12,777	7,884	2,165	10,904	4,022	2,134	36,842	16,973	1,810
Fermanagh	1,308	79,664	2,759	2,384	1,701	52	942	666	12,663	3,457	50,740	5,971
Londonderry, ...	1,491	93,731	16,483	8,892	5,002	2,050	6,898	1,227	4,096	23,530	18,194	12,381
Monaghan, ...	557	33,297	3,822	1,936	1,196	358	1,733	836	2,693	8,596	12,120	1,403
Tyrone	2,534	152,826	18,456	9,833	5,699	2,277	6,990	2,016	8,596	31,747	37,939	24,978
CONNAUGHT.												
Galway, ...	2,332	143,944	4,818	5,143	2,810	—	1,399	1,662	11,270	3,950	96,578	18,833
Leitrim, ...	666	40,791	569	943	730	—	125	188	6,192	763	28,727	3,234
Mayo, ...	1,612	97,859	2,807	2,833	1,975	6	776	958	6,709	3,115	59,181	22,457
Roscommon, ...	937	59,374	1,420	1,790	1,073	—	455	583	7,454	989	45,955	728
Sligo, ...	782	48,149	1,399	1,567	1,021	1	595	581	4,058	630	35,816	3,261
SUMMARY.												
LEINSTER	14,300	926,193	161,508	57,405	23,182	6	38,837	32,750	76,568	56,946	547,414	11,769
MUNSTER	22,928	1,431,215	87,026	72,064	32,889	40	37,417	25,166	149,816	87,156	863,077	109,453
ULSTER, ...	14,718	900,669	107,398	61,965	37,261	12,559	44,895	16,504	62,819	163,021	280,048	151,400
CONNAUGHT, ...	6,329	350,097	11,013	12,276	7,609	7	3,335	3,952	34,661	9,747	265,560	48,546
TOTAL OF IRELAND, ...	58,275	3,648,174	366,945	203,716	100,941	12,612	124,484	78,432	323,864	316,870	1,957,099	324,158

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

XIII.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Extent under Crops and Grass in each Class—*continued.*

Counties.	Holdings. Above 30 and not exceeding 50 Statute Acres.											
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land	Total Area under Corn Crops	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Potatoes.	Flax.	Hay. 1st Year's.	Hay. 2nd and 3rd Years'.	Hay. Permanent Meadow	Pasture. Under Rotation.	Pasture. Permanent	Mountain Land Grazed.
	No.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
Leinster.												
Carlow,	849	30,638	5,400	3,127	1,629	—	2,307	1,523	1,685	2,888	13,305	455
Dublin,	596	21,875	2,138	1,639	885	—	741	994	4,188	449	11,578	148
Kildare,	824	30,573	5,162	2,254	833	—	1,616	1,348	2,941	062	16,681	9
Kilkenny,	2,203	81,101	10,375	5,934	2,638	—	3,897	2,125	6,241	5,689	46,102	738
King's,	1,476	50,539	7,470	5,185	2,471	—	1,849	2,241	4,850	835	27,918	159
Longford,	1,206	42,026	2,257	2,543	1,784	—	960	781	7,036	1,551	26,780	118
Louth	619	22,417	5,566	2,768	1,246	9	1,887	1,097	838	2,950	7,097	205
Meath,	1,192	44,670	2,935	2,055	949	—	1,418	1,487	5,597	1,599	29,567	12
Queen's,	1,316	47,673	7,438	5,219	2,303	—	2,299	2,650	4,851	1,487	23,326	403
Westmeath,	1,331	48,504	2,623	2,460	1,344	—	983	1,134	5,863	679	34,700	62
Wexford	2,622	96,571	18,860	9,565	3,759	—	7,260	3,072	2,079	16,480	38,554	701
Wicklow,	1,131	38,533	3,290	2,236	1,195	—	1,705	2,495	3,171	2,183	20,680	2,923
Munster.												
Clare,	3,645	128,976	2,871	6,134	3,882	—	717	812	21,922	1,138	85,679	9,303
Cork	6,654	235,719	21,916	18,550	8,708	18	11,205	6,422	15,580	27,464	118,882	16,684
Kerry,	3,029	125,671	5,580	7,623	4,823	—	1,638	1,592	18,923	4,186	73,167	12,662
Limerick,	2,924	113,592	2,717	3,960	2,351	—	888	998	21,777	1,371	80,174	1,707
Tipperary	3,989	149,566	12,364	11,019	5,074	—	4,415	3,742	18,585	5,159	92,304	1,978
Waterford,	1,295	46,437	4,815	3,388	1,547	—	2,208	618	550	5,457	25,433	3,938
Ulster.												
Antrim,	3,617	131,783	16,419	11,715	8,599	3,244	9,459	3,969	12,471	25,034	42,548	6,924
Armagh,	1,432	49,844	7,672	4,565	2,825	1,165	4,146	2,062	5,121	10,312	14,100	701
Cavan,	2,424	82,763	6,618	5,403	4,021	326	3,226	1,844	11,007	8,503	44,621	1,115
Donegal,	4,063	134,736	16,007	9,457	5,841	1,346	3,671	547	8,245	16,700	35,849	42,914
Down,	3,244	114,549	24,777	14,087	9,000	3,011	11,718	3,548	1,619	39,265	14,191	2,333
Fermanagh,	2,359	83,476	4,016	3,577	2,684	92	1,253	855	14,233	3,938	51,740	3,772
Londonderry,	2,236	81,500	16,050	9,444	6,084	2,414	6,891	1,354	3,172	21,281	15,612	5,282
Monaghan,	1,549	52,862	7,967	3,755	2,822	724	3,037	1,222	3,674	17,621	13,371	971
Tyrone,	4,079	142,142	20,202	11,578	7,266	2,297	7,602	2,440	9,275	30,595	37,311	20,842
Connaught.												
Galway,	3,837	131,652	7,148	8,074	4,877	—	1,889	2,301	11,992	5,947	33,046	11,255
Leitrim,	1,792	63,270	1,453	2,477	1,936	5	283	499	10,566	1,787	43,256	3,035
Mayo,	3,019	100,655	5,061	5,331	3,862	5	1,420	1,517	7,124	4,964	60,598	14,832
Roscommon,	1,775	63,484	2,175	3,271	2,032	—	650	690	9,298	1,451	44,758	1,191
Sligo,	1,581	54,339	2,043	2,622	1,896	—	830	905	5,911	1,900	37,540	2,529
Summary.												
Leinster,	15,365	555,468	73,514	45,035	21,036	9	26,922	20,947	49,370	37,450	296,288	5,933
Munster,	22,436	800,561	50,293	50,674	26,385	16	21,071	14,484	97,337	44,775	475,639	46,272
Ulster,	25,053	873,555	119,748	73,581	49,142	14,619	51,603	17,841	68,717	173,249	269,343	84,854
Connaught,	12,067	413,400	17,880	21,778	14,513	10	5,131	5,822	44,890	16,049	269,198	32,642
Total of Ireland,	74,921	2,642,984	261,435	191,068	111,076	14,654	104,727	59,094	260,314	271,523	1,310,468	169,701

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XIII.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Extent under Crops and Grass in each Class—*continued.*

Counties.	HOLDINGS. Above 15 and not exceeding 30 Statute Acres.											
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land	Total Area under Corn Crops	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Potatoes	Flax	Hay 1st Year's.	Hay 2nd and 3rd Years'.	Hay Permanent Meadow.	Pasture Under Rotation.	Pasture Permanent	Mountain Land Grazed
	No.	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres
LEINSTER.												
Carlow, ...	955	19,693	3,749	2,355	1,303	—	1,563	987	1,357	1,267	3,260	106
Dublin, ...	909	18,201	1,681	1,649	770	—	755	860	3,911	510	8,771	164
Kildare, ...	1,130	22,616	3,206	2,066	839	—	1,161	1,125	2,788	457	11,784	28
Kilkenny, ...	2,444	50,063	6,488	4,183	2,049	—	2,401	1,683	4,899	3,189	26,397	323
King's, ...	2,104	42,616	6,960	5,323	2,732	—	1,418	1,883	4,255	1,203	21,529	40
Longford	2,626	52,187	3,694	4,341	3,151	2	1,452	1,333	9,857	3,241	28,509	268
Louth, ...	1,389	28,117	6,797	3,854	1,926	35	2,503	1,330	1,099	4,164	8,208	137
Meath, ...	1,868	38,305	3,399	2,502	1,497	—	1,618	1,627	6,112	1,652	21,381	14
Queen's, ...	2,028	41,198	7,306	5,402	2,716	—	2,184	2,318	4,160	1,164	18,447	217
Westmeath, ...	2,109	43,807	3,083	3,246	1,857	—	1,148	1,200	6,569	1,001	27,524	38
Wexford, ...	2,990	61,315	12,267	6,950	3,176	—	4,550	2,009	1,615	10,390	23,236	298
Wicklow	1,191	24,153	2,065	1,062	1,136	—	1,132	1,613	2,506	975	13,177	1,083
MUNSTER.												
Clare, ...	4,792	92,426	2,763	6,250	4,344	—	585	672	18,887	626	38,763	3,880
Cork, ...	6,241	129,211	12,299	11,943	6,470	10	6,102	3,828	9,022	13,955	63,222	8,930
Kerry, ...	3,899	77,135	3,759	5,778	3,969	—	1,048	1,226	10,997	2,787	45,111	6,420
Limerick, ...	3,076	64,764	1,907	3,128	1,881	—	665	664	12,405	1,054	42,253	088
Tipperary, ...	4,797	101,226	8,877	8,715	4,204	—	2,747	2,899	14,031	2,779	60,286	892
Waterford, ...	1,388	28,470	3,255	2,577	1,441	—	1,439	385	330	3,050	15,160	2,244
ULSTER.												
Antrim, ...	6,012	125,503	16,586	12,613	9,931	3,290	9,774	3,970	11,964	27,606	35,585	3,815
Armagh, ...	4,393	85,086	14,529	8,911	6,093	2,190	7,350	2,737	7,307	19,437	21,587	1,638
Cavan, ...	7,055	136,988	12,514	10,480	8,455	552	5,891	3,018	19,323	14,157	69,953	1,100
Donegal, ...	8,533	157,178	21,403	14,601	10,232	1,253	4,223	840	13,150	17,040	44,644	40,024
Down, ...	6,447	123,793	27,741	15,798	11,203	3,959	13,254	3,763	2,004	45,157	13,315	3,802
Fermanagh, ...	4,121	83,849	4,744	4,530	3,675	84	1,329	916	16,063	4,162	49,875	2,115
Londonderry, ...	4,518	89,839	17,521	11,304	8,130	3,017	7,795	1,479	4,448	22,828	17,938	3,509
Monaghan	5,036	96,316	16,951	9,332	6,921	1,357	7,888	1,949	4,803	38,518	19,810	713
Tyrone, ...	7,813	156,856	25,224	15,512	13,673	2,578	10,309	3,245	11,218	33,720	39,959	15,691
CONNAUGHT.												
Galway, ...	9,290	180,319	13,284	15,336	10,431	—	3,102	3,724	17,813	10,287	105,354	11,409
Leitrim, ...	5,209	104,606	3,374	5,926	4,780	3	460	828	19,821	3,172	68,543	2,479
Mayo, ...	10,033	187,318	14,006	15,195	11,651	18	3,645	3,977	13,631	15,686	107,109	14,051
Roscommon, ...	6,124	106,890	5,894	8,690	6,226	—	1,453	1,732	19,292	4,161	64,163	1,436
Sligo, ...	4,454	94,695	4,613	6,099	4,426	—	1,568	1,710	10,588	3,426	63,871	2,820
SUMMARY.												
LEINSTER, ...	21,803	442,271	60,695	43,373	23,152	37	21,885	17,968	48,628	29,208	217,723	2,764
MUNSTER, ...	24,293	493,229	32,890	38,391	22,309	10	12,586	9,574	67,672	24,251	284,795	22,963
ULSTER, ...	53,928	1,060,408	157,213	103,081	78,313	18,280	67,804	21,917	90,310	217,629	312,966	71,208
CONNAUGHT, ...	35,110	673,828	41,171	51,246	37,514	21	10,228	12,031	81,145	36,732	409,060	32,194
TOTAL OF IRELAND, ...	135,134	2,669,736	291,969	236,091	161,288	18,348	112,503	61,590	287,755	307,820	1,224,541	129,119

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

XIII.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Extent under Crops and Grass in each Class—*continued.*

APPENDIX V.

Counties.	HOLDINGS. Above 5 and not exceeding 15 Statute Acres.											
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land.	Total Area under Corn Crops.	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Potatoes	Flax.	Hay. 1st Year's.	Hay. 2nd and 3rd Years'	Hay. Permanent Meadow.	Pasture. Under Rotation.	Pasture. Permanent.	Mountain Land Grazed
	No	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.
Leinster.												
Carlow, ...	830	7 568	1,353	1,921	691	—	550	370	713	424	3,077	57
Dublin, ...	1 541	12 551	1,148	1,523	743	—	500	672	2,341	276	5 914	175
Kildare, ...	1,685	14,834	2 106	1,691	799	—	752	840	2,223	252	6,921	16
Kilkenny, ...	2,413	24,615	2,718	1,975	1,161	—	887	672	2,901	1,048	14,295	119
King's, ...	2 265	21,232	3 490	3,136	1,871	—	676	1,088	2,563	395	9,908	6
Longford, ...	2,448	24,327	2,033	2 675	2,039	1	771	587	4 684	1,604	11,863	109
Louth, ...	2,427	21 571	5,004	3,405	2,303	24	1,754	921	968	3,352	3,010	102
Meath, ...	2,521	24 881	2,233	2 176	1 405	—	1,043	1,157	5 603	706	11,961	2
Queen's, ...	2,186	20,352	3,990	3,241	1,552	—	1,095	1 294	2,298	405	6,025	34
Westmeath, ...	2,336	22,469	1,759	2,264	1,439	—	583	675	4,344	395	12,447	2
Wexford, ...	3,095	28 840	5,079	3,431	1 868	—	1,960	1,027	983	4,985	11,512	509
Wicklow, ...	1,298	11,952	1,060	1,053	672	—	519	940	1,483	549	6 104	244
Munster.												
Clare, ...	3,418	33,573	1,094	2,776	2,094	—	250	344	8 051	437	19,999	622
Cork, ...	4,672	43 921	3,894	4,688	3 034	1	1 865	1,142	3,971	3 795	22,627	1,938
Kerry, ...	3,142	35,813	1 464	2,740	2 017	—	341	599	4,350	1,115	15,627	9,577
Limerick, ...	2,357	22,581	759	1,571	1 008	—	257	287	5,756	419	13,360	176
Tipperary, ...	4,252	40,562	3,451	4,015	2,292	—	1 082	1,152	6,595	1 088	22,923	256
Waterford, ...	1,441	13 825	1,403	2 357	746	—	651	274	269	1,122	6,859	890
Ulster.												
Antrim, ...	5,310	51,112	6,677	5,815	4,899	1,203	4,316	1,581	5 916	10,332	14,655	585
Armagh, ...	8 209	89,231	12,566	8,439	6,876	1,721	6 350	2,201	6,240	14,847	16,432	424
Cavan, ...	6,863	63,538	7,613	6,513	5 705	234	3,154	1,820	6,219	6,926	31 058	201
Donegal, ...	16,375	95,649	14,569	11,914	9 135	287	2,399	606	10 276	9,755	29,769	15,674
Down	8,045	81,343	15 855	10,249	6,150	2 338	8,257	2,144	1,594	29,183	10 537	1,186
Fermanagh, ...	3,301	32,285	2 039	2,151	1 941	31	445	334	7,652	1,283	18,048	302
Londonderry, ...	4,979	47,584	9,254	6,782	5 555	1,557	4,594	391	2,509	11 901	8,982	814
Monaghan, ...	7,122	69 452	12,677	7,303	6 091	698	5,861	1 [illegible]59	4,616	23,652	13,124	162
Tyrone, ...	7,746	74 777	13,166	8,989	6,959	1,405	5,635	1 856	6,067	17,103	18 537	2,019
Connaught.												
Galway, ...	12,168	114,719	10,845	13,173	10,026	—	1,926	2,431	11,791	6,589	59,704	8,257
Leitrim, ...	5,213	53,507	2,117	3,878	3,387	1	103	418	12,053	1,570	32,876	491
Mayo, ...	15,040	146,458	16,642	16,595	14,085	5	3,264	3,355	11,293	12,058	73,704	10,542
Roscommon	8,527	80,111	5,534	8,311	6 514	—	1,678	1,313	15,175	2,895	45,234	571
Sligo	5,407	51,890	3,431	5,050	4,152	—	1,172	1 008	7,775	1,855	30,905	644
Summary.												
Leinster, ...	25,045	235,058	31,973	27,598	16 848	25	11,090	10,243	31 101	13,553	103,037	1,435
Munster, ...	19,282	190,275	12 065	18,147	11 191	1	4,416	3,793	28,992	7,976	101,391	13,459
Ulster, ...	62,550	534 671	94,418	68,155	55,311	9,574	41,019	12,595	51,419	124,9[illegible]2	161,142	21,667
Connaught, ...	46 355	446 635	37,619	47,007	38,164	6	7,543	6,523	58,087	24 967	242 423	20,505
Total of Ireland, ...	153,232	1 456,989	176,075	180,907	121.514	9.606	64,093	35,164	169,602	171,478	612,993	57 066

M

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XIV.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Percentage of the Total Agricultural Land in each such Class under each Crop and under Grass.

Counties	Holdings above 200 Statute Acres.											
							Hay			Pasture.		
	Number of Holdings	Total Area of Agricultural Land.	Total Area under Corn Crops.	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Potatoes	Flax.	1st Year's	2nd and 3rd Years'.	Permanent Meadow	Under Rotation	Permanent	Mountain Land Grazed
	No.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres.
LEINSTER.												
Carlow,	116	32,542	8·2	3·7	1·1	—	3·5	3·1	8·5	4·0	67·6	1·4
Dublin,	140	39,573	2·7	0·7	0·6	—	1·2	1·6	9·6	1·0	77·0	6·2
Kildare,	389	124,747	4·3	2·0	0·4	—	1·5	1·4	6·5	1·0	83·2	0·1
Kilkenny,	228	61,650	5·0	2·4	0·6	—	1·8	1·5	7·1	2·9	75·6	3·7
King's,	308	83,849	2·9	2·0	0·5	—	1·3	1·4	6·7	1·3	80·1	4·3
Longford,	78	18,916	1·1	0·9	0·5	—	0·2	0·4	9·7	0·9	86·8	—
Louth,	130	36,461	8·6	4·3	1·3	0·0	3·1	2·9	5·4	7·4	61·6	5·7
Meath,	655	210,470	1·4	1·0	0·3	—	0·6	0·8	7·1	0·8	88·3	0·0
Queen's,	284	78,209	4·9	2·8	0·7	—	1·6	1·9	7·3	1·4	69·6	10·5
Westmeath	325	101,293	0·9	0·9	0·3	—	0·4	0·5	6·8	0·7	89·9	0·1
Wexford,	206	53,628	9·9	4·7	0·9	—	4·1	2·4	2·1	12·2	57·0	7·0
Wicklow,	362	142,224	2·5	1·7	0·3	—	1·2	1·7	2·2	2·9	40·1	47·7
MUNSTER.												
Clare,	422	124,929	0·8	1·0	0·5	—	0·3	0·4	6·3	0·4	64·7	26·1
Cork,	817	206,141	4·4	2·9	0·3	—	2·2	1·7	5·1	6·4	48·7	28·6
Kerry,	699	195,009	0·7	0·8	0·5	—	0·2	0·3	3·6	0·6	35·2	58·6
Limerick,	202	76,444	1·0	1·1	0·5	—	0·4	0·3	14·1	0·4	67·1	15·6
Tipperary,	620	183,011	2·6	1·8	0·5	0·0	1·0	0·8	8·4	1·0	66·6	17·9
Waterford,	253	75,683	4·0	2·0	0·5	—	1·7	1·1	1·5	4·7	48·8	36·2
ULSTER.												
Antrim,	210	89,255	1·5	1·0	0·5	0·2	0·7	0·5	3·9	3·2	29·8	59·2
Armagh,	20	4,718	3·7	1·8	0·7	0·2	3·5	1·2	9·1	5·2	42·3	33·0
Cavan,	75	15,411	1·4	1·1	0·9	0·0	0·8	0·6	7·9	6·1	50·4	31·7
Donegal,	468	164,871	1·4	0·8	0·4	0·1	0·3	0·0	1·1	1·3	13·9	81·1
Down,	104	34,920	4·8	2·7	1·0	0·3	2·4	1·0	1·9	9·3	26·8	56·8
Fermanagh,	89	24,010	0·9	0·7	0·4	0·0	0·4	0·4	9·0	0·8	54·3	33·5
Londonderry	176	61,553	3·8	2·0	0·9	0·2	1·8	0·2	1·3	8·2	19·3	63·2
Monaghan,	25	5,822	4·9	1·8	0·7	—	1·9	1·2	10·0	4·9	67·8	7·5
Tyrone,	190	67,086	2·0	1·0	0·5	0·1	0·7	0·2	2·6	3·0	15·9	76·5
CONNAUGHT.												
Galway,	1,014	350,108	0·8	0·8	0·3	—	0·3	0·3	3·2	0·8	50·8	43·0
Leitrim,	39	11,311	0·4	0·6	0·4	—	0·2	0·3	4·7	2·7	50·6	40·5
Mayo,	618	282,762	0·4	0·4	0·2	0·0	0·1	0·1	1·0	0·3	26·2	71·5
Roscommon,	287	78,558	0·9	1·0	0·5	—	0·3	0·4	8·6	0·2	38·0	0·6
Sligo,	157	51,761	1·1	1·0	0·6	—	0·4	0·5	2·7	0·7	51·1	42·5
SUMMARY.												
LEINSTER	3,224	983,542	3·5	1·9	0·5	0·0	1·4	1·4	6·2	2·3	74·0	9·3
MUNSTER,	3,073	861,217	2·3	1·7	0·6	0·0	1·0	0·8	6·1	2·4	53·5	32·2
ULSTER,	1,357	467,646	2·1	1·1	0·5	0·1	0·9	0·3	2·8	3·7	22·9	66·1
CONNAUGHT,	2,115	774,500	0·7	0·7	0·3	0·0	0·2	0·3	3·1	0·5	45·5	49·0
TOTAL OF IRELAND,	9,769	3,086,905	2·3	1·4	0·5	0·0	0·9	0·8	4·9	2·1	53·4	34·2

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

XIV.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Percentage of the Total Agricultural Land in each such Class under each Crop and under Grass—*continued.*

Counties.	Holdings. Above 100 and not exceeding 200 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area of Agricultural Land.	Total Area under Corn Crops.	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes).	Potatoes.	Flax.	Hay. 1st Year's.	Hay. 2nd and 3rd Years'	Hay. Permanent Meadow.	Pasture. Under Rotation.	Pasture. Permanent.	Mountain Land Grazed.
	No.	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres
Leinster.												
Carlow	353	44 772	10·8	5·5	2·0	—	4·5	3·7	7·9	4·8	61·4	1·4
Dublin, ...	399	53,903	6·9	3·8	2·1	—	2·5	3·5	12·5	1·6	67·7	1·5
Kildare, ...	735	83,497	9·1	4·6	1·1	—	3·7	3·7	10·2	2·2	66·4	0·1
Kilkenny, ...	822	101,977	7·9	4·0	1·3	—	3·0	2·1	7·8	5·2	67·7	2·3
King's, ...	578	71,069	6·6	4·3	1·5	—	2·3	2·5	8·6	2·1	72·4	1·2
Longford, ...	195	23,573	1·6	1·8	0·9	—	0·7	0·7	15·5	0·7	79·2	—
Louth, ...	229	28,644	14·4	7·6	2·7	0·0	5·0	3·8	4·5	13·4	48·4	2·3
Meath	921	130,096	2·5	1·6	0·5	—	1·1	1·4	9·1	3·0	81·3	0·0
Queen's, ...	606	76,929	9·2	5·2	3·3	—	3·2	3·8	10·2	2·4	63·9	2·1
Westmeath, ...	648	68,363	1·7	1·5	0·7	—	0·7	0·9	9·1	0·9	84·9	0·3
Wexford	871	105,939	14·8	6·9	1·8	—	5·5	2·8	2·1	15·4	51·0	1·7
Wicklow, ...	719	90,342	5·4	3·4	1·1	—	2·5	4·0	6·1	4·5	64·0	10·1
Munster												
Clare, ...	927	108,278	1·1	1·8	1·0	—	0·3	0·3	11·9	0·5	67·6	18·5
Cork	3,380	394,186	7·6	5·1	1·7	0·0	3·7	2·4	6·6	10·6	54·1	9·9
Kerry, ...	1,702	193,690	1·9	2·4	1·4	—	0·7	0·8	8·7	1·6	63·9	29·7
Limerick, ...	1,039	129,185	1·4	1·8	1·0	—	0·6	0·6	18·4	1·7	72·1	3·4
Tipperary	1,481	182,853	5·7	4·0	1·3	—	2·1	1·8	10·5	2·5	69·8	3·6
Waterford, ...	812	97,588	8·5	4·3	1·3	—	3·5	1·4	1·0	10·9	62·9	7·5
Ulster.												
Antrim	524	64,135	6·9	4·4	2·8	0·9	3·9	2·4	7·1	11·7	39·5	23·2
Armagh, ...	99	11,438	6·6	3·8	1·9	0·8	4·3	3·7	15·0	15·2	46·2	4·4
Cavan, ...	224	25,240	3·7	2·6	1·6	0·2	1·8	1·8	12·2	7·4	64·7	5·6
Donegal	1,031	113,420	8·6	4·1	1·7	1·0	2·4	—	2·7	11·1	22·1	48·0
Down, ...	334	39,447	15·4	9·3	5·3	0·8	7·2	4·2	3·0	29·1	25·8	5·2
Fermanagh, ...	353	40,804	2·0	1·7	1·1	0·0	0·6	0·6	13·2	2·2	63·8	15·9
Londonderry, ...	435	49,920	14·3	6·7	3·2	1·4	5·2	1·2	2·7	23·9	20·5	24·1
Monaghan, ...	109	12,224	6·8	3·0	1·4	0·5	3·0	3·3	7·7	13·1	59·3	3·3
Tyrone, ...	581	66,207	8·2	4·5	2·2	1·0	1·3	1·0	4·9	13·9	29·5	39·7
Connaught.												
Galway	1,214	146,356	1·7	1·7	0·8	—	0·7	0·7	5·7	2·1	71·2	18·2
Leitrim, ...	166	16,158	1·2	1·7	1·2	—	0·2	0·6	14·1	1·2	64·8	16·2
Mayo	723	87,937	1·4	1·5	1·0	0·0	0·3	0·5	4·2	1·2	60·3	30·8
Roscommon, ...	532	69,093	1·2	1·4	0·8	—	0·5	0·7	10·1	1·1	84·0	1·0
Sligo, . ..	314	38,002	1·8	2·2	1·2	—	0·9	0·7	6·4	1·3	71·4	15·3
Summary												
Leinster, ...	6,976	879,104	7·4	4·0	1·3	0·0	2·9	2·7	8·2	4·8	68·0	2·0
Munster, ...	9,341	1,105,780	5·0	3·6	1·4	0·0	2·2	1·6	9·0	5·7	60·9	12·0
Ulster, ...	3,690	422,836	8·5	4·7	2·4	0·9	3·3	1·4	5·8	13·6	34·2	27·4
Connaught, ...	2,949	357,548	1·5	1·6	0·9	0·0	0·5	0·6	6·6	1·5	70·3	16·9
Total of Ireland.	22,956	2,765,266	5·9	3·7	1·4	0·1	2·4	1·8	7·9	5·1	60·3	11·8

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XIV.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Percentage of the Total Agricultural Land in each such Class under each Crop and under Grass—*continued.*

Counties.	HOLDINGS. Above 50 and not exceeding 100 Statute Acres.											
							Hay			Pasture		
	Number of Holdings.	Total Area of Agricultural Land	Total Area under Corn Crops	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Potatoes.	Flax	1st Year's	2nd and 3rd Years'.	Permanent Meadow	Under Rotation	Permanent	Mountain Land Grazed.
	No	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres
Leinster.												
Carlow,	846	55,122	14·9	8·2	3·8	—	6·2	5·0	7·2	7·0	50·4	1·1
Dublin,	625	41,032	9·1	6·6	3·5	—	3·6	5·0	16·5	1·8	57·0	0·4
Kildare,	956	65,465	10·4	5·5	1·6	—	4·1	4·4	8·6	2·7	61·0	0·3
Kilkenny,	2,119	133,919	11·6	5·8	2·3	—	4·3	2·7	7·1	3·7	60·1	1·7
King's,	1,239	78,536	11·9	7·0	3·0	—	3·2	3·7	8·9	1·6	61·0	0·7
Longford,	607	39,244	3·3	3·8	2·2	0·0	1·3	1·3	15·4	2·0	72·7	0·2
Louth,	467	31,393	19·1	9·0	3·4	0·0	7·0	4·4	3·8	12·4	43·7	0·6
Meath,	1,215	80,931	4·9	5·0	1·3	—	2·3	2·5	11·8	3·3	72·2	9·0
Queen's,	1,266	80,177	12·9	8·1	3·1	—	4·4	5·0	10·6	3·0	55·3	0·7
Westmeath,	1,065	69,450	3·8	3·2	1·6	—	1·6	1·8	11·0	1·2	77·3	0·1
Wexford,	2,500	160,713	17·6	8·5	2·8	—	6·5	3·0	2·7	15·7	44·8	1·2
Wicklow,	1,395	90,211	7·0	4·6	2·0	—	3·4	5·0	7·2	5·1	58·7	2·0
Munster.												
Clare,	2,791	168,792	1·7	3·2	1·9	—	0·5	0·6	15·0	0·8	66·8	11·4
Cork,	8,057	503,850	8·9	8·6	2·6	0·0	4·4	2·6	6·6	11·4	51·7	7·8
Kerry,	3,911	236,044	7·3	8·8	5·4	—	2·4	2·7	26·2	5·9	13·8	32·9
Limerick,	2,930	190,104	2·2	2·9	1·6	—	0·8	0·8	19·4	1·0	70·6	2·3
Tipperary,	3,533	225,837	7·5	5·5	2·3	—	2·7	2·3	11·5	3·3	65·4	1·8
Waterford,	1,876	106,588	10·3	5·8	2·3	—	4·1	1·5	0·9	11·9	57·2	7·7
Ulster.												
Antrim,	2,372	155,550	10·5	7·1	4·7	1·8	5·7	3·0	8·4	16·2	33·7	13·6
Armagh,	567	33,675	12·7	7·1	3·8	1·9	6·9	4·5	11·7	17·5	35·7	2·0
Cavan,	933	58,043	5·0	4·2	3·0	0·3	2·8	1·9	12·5	8·4	61·8	2·6
Donegal,	3,152	183,357	10·1	5·6	3·0	1·1	2·6	0·3	4·6	12·5	23·9	30·0
Down,	1,801	110,526	20·7	11·6	7·1	2·0	9·9	3·7	1·9	33·2	15·4	1·9
Fermanagh,	1,303	79,664	3·5	3·0	2·1	0·1	1·2	0·8	15·9	4·3	63·7	7·5
Londonderry,	1,491	93,731	17·6	9·4	5·3	2·2	7·4	1·3	4·4	25·1	19·4	18·2
Monaghan,	557	33,297	11·5	5·3	3·6	1·1	5·2	2·5	8·1	25·2	36·4	4·2
Tyrone,	2,534	152,826	12·0	6·3	3·7	1·3	4·4	1·2	5·5	20·6	26·0	22·7
Connaught.												
Galway,	2,332	143,944	3·3	3·5	1·9	—	0·9	1·6	7·8	2·7	67·0	13·2
Leitrim,	666	40,791	1·4	2·3	1·8	—	0·3	0·5	15·2	1·9	70·4	5·0
Mayo,	1,612	97,839	2·9	2·9	2·0	0·0	0·8	1·0	5·3	3.2	60·5	22·9
Roscommon,	937	59,374	2·4	3·0	1·8	—	0·8	1·0	12·6	1·6	77·4	1·2
Sligo,	782	48,149	2·9	3·3	2·1	0·0	1·2	1·2	8·4	1·9	74·4	8.7
Summary.												
Leinster,	14,300	926,193	11·0	6·2	2·5	0·0	4·2	3·5	8·3	6·1	59·1	1·6
Munster,	22,928	1,431,215	6·0	5·0	2·3	0·0	2·6	1·8	10·5	6·1	60·3	7·7
Ulster,	14,718	900,669	12·0	6·9	4·1	1·3	5·0	1·9	7·0	13·0	31·0	16·9
Connaught,	6,329	390,097	2·9	3·2	1·9	0·0	0·8	1·0	8·9	2·5	68·3	12·4
Total of Ireland,	58,275	3,648,174	8·4	5·6	4·7	0·3	3·4	2·1	8·9	3·7	53·7	8·9

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

XIV.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Percentage of the Total Agricultural Land in each such Class under each Crop and under Grass—*continued*

Counties	Holdings. Above 30 and not exceeding 50 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area of Agricultural Land	Total Area under Corn Crops	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Potatoes	Flax	Hay. 1st Year's	Hay. 2nd and 3rd Years'	Hay. Permanent Meadow	Pasture. Under Rotation	Pasture. Permanent	Mountain Land Grazed
	No	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
Leinster.												
Carlow,	849	30,688	17·6	10·2	5·3	—	7·5	5·0	5·5	9·4	43·3	1·5
Dublin	596	21,875	9·8	7·5	4·0	—	3·4	4·5	19·1	2·1	52·9	0·7
Kildare,	824	30,673	16·8	7·4	2·7	—	5·3	4·4	9·6	2·2	54·3	0·0
Kilkenny,	2,203	81,101	12·9	7·4	3·2	—	5·0	2·9	7·9	7·2	55·6	1·1
King's	1,476	50,539	14·8	10·3	4·9	—	3·7	4·4	9·7	1·6	55·2	0·3
Longford,	1,266	42,026	5·4	6·1	4·2	—	2·3	1·9	16·7	3·6	63·7	0·3
Louth,	619	22,417	24·8	12·3	5·6	0·1	8·4	4·9	3·7	13·2	31·7	0·9
Meath,	1,192	44,670	6·6	4·7	2·1	—	3·1	3·3	12·6	8·6	66·1	0·0
Queen's,	1,316	47,673	15·6	10·9	4·8	—	4·8	5·6	10·2	3·1	48·9	0·9
Westmeath,	1,331	48,504	5·4	5·1	2·8	—	2·0	2·3	12·1	1·4	71·6	0·1
Wexford,	2,622	90,571	19·5	9·9	3·8	—	7·5	3·2	2·2	17·1	39·9	0·7
Wicklow,	1,131	38,533	8·5	6·0	3·0	—	4·5	6·5	8·0	5·7	53·3	7·5
Munster.												
Clare,	3,645	128,576	2·2	4·7	3·0	—	0·6	0·7	17·1	0·9	66·6	7·2
Cork	6,654	236,719	9·3	7·8	3·7	0·0	4·7	2·7	6·0	11·6	50·2	7·1
Kerry,	3,929	125,671	4·4	6·1	3·8	—	1·3	1·5	15·1	3·3	58·2	10·1
Limerick,	2,924	113,592	2·4	3·5	2·1	—	0·8	0·9	19·1	1·2	70·0	1·5
Tipperary,	3,989	149,566	8·3	7·4	3·4	—	3·0	2·5	12·4	3·4	61·7	1·3
Waterford,	1,295	46,437	10·4	7·3	3·3	—	4·8	1·3	1·2	11·7	54·8	3·5
Ulster.												
Antrim	3,617	131,783	12·5	8·9	6·5	2·5	7·2	3·0	9·5	18·9	32·3	5·2
Armagh,	1,432	49,844	15·4	9·2	5·7	2·3	8·3	4·1	10·3	20·7	28·3	1·4
Cavan,	2,424	82,783	8·0	6·5	4·9	0·4	3·9	2·2	13·4	10·3	53·9	1·4
Donegal,	4,063	134,736	11·9	7·0	4·3	0·9	2·7	0·4	6·1	12·5	26·6	31·9
Down,	3,244	114,549	11·6	14·3	7·9	2·6	10·2	3·1	1·4	34·3	12·5	2·0
Fermanagh,	2,359	83,476	4·8	4·3	3·2	0·1	1·5	1·0	17·1	4·7	62·0	4·5
Londonderry,	2,286	81,500	19·7	11·6	7·5	2·9	8·5	1·7	3·8	26·1	19·2	0·5
Monaghan,	1,549	52,802	15·1	7·1	5·3	1·4	6·9	2·3	6·8	33·3	25·3	1·8
Tyrone,	4,079	142,142	14·2	8·1	5·1	1·6	5·4	1·7	6·6	21·5	26·3	14·7
Connaught.												
Galway,	3,897	131,652	5·4	6·1	3·7	—	1·4	1·8	9·1	4·6	63·0	8·6
Leitrim,	1,792	63,270	2·3	3·9	3·1	0·0	0·5	0·6	16·7	2·8	65·4	4·8
Mayo	3,019	100,655	4·9	5·3	3·8	—	1·4	1·5	7·0	4·9	60·5	14·5
Roscommon,	1,775	63,484	3·4	5·2	3·2	—	1·0	1·1	14·6	2·3	70·5	1·9
Sligo,	1,584	54,339	3·8	4·8	3·3	—	1·6	1·7	10·9	3·5	69·1	4·6
Summary.												
Leinster,	15,365	555,468	13·2	8·1	3·8	—	4·9	3·8	8·9	6·7	53·3	1·1
Munster,	22,436	800,561	6·3	6·3	3·3	0·0	2·7	1·8	12·2	5·6	59·3	5·8
Ulster,	25,053	873,555	13·7	8·4	5·6	1·6	5·9	2·0	7·8	19·9	30·9	9·8
Connaught,	12,067	413,400	4·3	5·3	3·5	0·0	1·3	1·4	10·8	3·9	65·1	7·9
Total of Ireland,	74,921	2,642,984	9·9	7·3	4·1	0·5	3·9	2·2	9·9	10·3	49·6	6·4

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XIV.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Percentage of the Total Agricultural Land in each such Class under each Crop and under Grass—*continued.*

Counties.	Holdings. Above 15 and not exceeding 30 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area of Agricultural Land.	Total Area under Corn Crops.	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes)	Potatoes.	Flax	Hay. 1st Year's.	Hay. 2nd and 3rd Years'	Hay. Permanent Meadow	Pasture. Under Rotation	Pasture. Permanent	Mountain Land Grazed.
	No	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres
Leinster.												
Carlow, ...	905	19,693	19·0	12·0	6·6	—	8·0	5·0	6·9	6·4	41·9	0·8
Dublin, ...	909	18,201	9·2	8·5	4·2	—	4·2	4·7	21·5	2·8	48·2	0·9
Kildare, ...	1,130	22,816	14·2	9·1	3·7	—	5·1	5·0	12·3	2·0	52·2	0·1
Kilkenny, ...	2,444	50,063	13·0	8·3	4·0	—	4·8	3·3	9·8	6·3	53·8	0·7
King's, ...	2,104	42,616	16·3	12·5	6·4	—	3·3	4·4	10·0	2·9	50·5	0·1
Longford, ...	2,626	52,187	7·1	8·3	6·0	0·0	2·8	2·5	17·9	6·2	54·7	0·5
Louth, ...	1,389	28,117	24·2	13·6	6·9	0·1	8·9	4·8	3·9	14·8	29·2	0·5
Meath, ...	1,868	38,305	8·9	6·5	3·0	—	4·2	4·2	16·0	4·3	55·9	0·0
Queen's, ...	2,028	41,198	17·8	13·1	6·6	—	5·3	5·6	10·1	2·8	44·8	0·5
Westmeath, ...	2,169	43,807	7·0	7·4	4·2	—	2·6	2·7	15·0	2·3	62·9	0·1
Wexford, ...	2,990	61,315	20·0	11·3	5·1	—	7·4	3·2	2·7	17·0	37·9	0·5
Wicklow, ...	1,191	24,153	8·6	8·7	4·7	—	4·7	6·7	10·3	4·0	54·6	4·4
Munster.												
Clare, ...	4,792	92,426	3·0	6·8	4·7	—	0·6	0·7	20·4	0·7	63·6	4·2
Cork, ...	6,341	129,211	9·5	9·3	5·0	0·0	4·7	3·0	7·0	10·3	45·9	6·8
Kerry, ...	3,899	77,135	4·9	7·5	5·1	—	1·4	1·8	14·3	3·6	58·5	8·2
Limerick, ...	3,076	64,764	2·9	4·7	2·9	—	1·0	1·0	22·1	1·6	65·1	1·6
Tipperary, ...	4,797	101,226	8·8	8·0	4·2	—	2·7	2·8	13·9	2·7	59·6	0·9
Waterford, ...	1,388	28,470	11·5	9·1	5·1	—	5·1	1·3	1·2	10·7	53·2	7·9
Ulster.												
Antrim, —	6,012	125,503	13·2	10·1	7·9	2·5	7·8	3·2	9·6	22·0	28·3	3·0
Armagh, ...	4,393	85,086	17·1	10·5	7·2	2·6	8·6	3·2	8·6	22·8	25·4	1·2
Cavan	7,055	136,988	9·1	7·7	6·2	0·4	4·3	2·2	14·0	10·1	51·1	0·8
Donegal, ...	8,533	157,178	13·3	9·3	6·5	0·8	2·7	0·5	8·4	10·8	28·4	25·5
Down, —	8,447	128,793	21·6	12·3	8·6	3·1	10·3	2·9	1·6	35·0	10·3	2·9
Fermanagh, ...	4,121	83,849	5·6	5·4	4·4	0·1	1·6	1·1	19·3	5·0	59·4	2·5
Londonderry, ...	4,518	89,859	19·5	12·6	9·5	3·4	8·7	1·7	4·9	25·4	19·9	3·9
Monaghan, ...	5,036	96,316	17·6	9·7	7·2	1·4	8·2	2·0	5·0	34·8	20·6	0·7
Tyrone, ...	7,813	156,856	16·0	9·7	8·7	1·6	6·5	2·6	7·1	21·5	25·4	9·6
Connaught.												
Galway, ...	9,290	180,319	7·6	8·7	5·9	—	1·8	2·1	10·2	5·9	57·2	6·5
Leitrim, ...	5,209	104,606	3·2	5·7	4·6	0·0	0·4	0·8	19·0	3·0	66·5	2·4
Mayo, ...	10,033	187,318	7·5	8·0	8·2	0·0	2·0	2·1	7·3	8·4	57·2	7·5
Roscommon, ...	6,124	106,890	5·5	8·1	5·8	-	1·3	1·7	18·1	3·9	60·1	1·3
Sligo, ...	4,454	94,695	4·9	6·4	4·7	—	1·7	1·8	11·2	3·6	67·4	3·0
Summary.												
Leinster, ...	21,803	442,271	13·7	9·8	5·2	0·0	5·0	4·1	11·0	6·8	49·2	0·8
Munster, ...	24,293	493,229	6·7	7·8	4·5	0·0	2·5	1·9	13·7	4·9	57·8	4·7
Ulster, ...	53,928	1,060,408	14·9	9·8	7·3	1·8	6·3	2·0	8·5	20·5	29·6	6·7
Connaught, ... — ...	35,110	673,828	6·1	7·6	5·0	0·0	1·5	1·8	12·0	5·5	60·7	4·8
Total of Ireland, ...	135,134	2,669,736	10·9	8·9	6·0	0·7	4·2	2·3	10·8	11·5	45·9	4·8

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

XIV.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Percentage of the Total Agricultural Land in each such Class under each Crop and under Grass—*continued.*

Counties	Holdings: Above 5 and not exceeding 15 Statute Acres											
	Number of Holdings.	Total Area of Agricultural Land.	Total Area under Corn Crops	Total Area under Green Crops (including Potatoes).	Potatoes	Flax.	Hay. 1st Year's.	Hay. 2nd and 3rd Years'	Hay. Permanent Meadow.	Pasture. Under Rotation	Pasture. Permanent	Mountain Land Grazed.
	No.	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
Leinster												
Carlow,	830	7,568	17·9	16·5	9·1	—	7·3	4·9	9·4	5·6	40·6	0·8
Dublin,	1,541	12,551	9·1	12·1	5·9	—	4·0	5·2	18·7	2·2	47·3	1·4
Kildare,	1,635	14,534	14·2	11·4	5·3	—	5·1	5·6	15·0	1·9	46·7	0·1
Kilkenny,	2,413	24,615	11·0	8·0	4·7	—	3·7	2·8	11·6	4·2	58·0	0·5
King's,	2,265	21,262	13·4	14·8	8·8	—	3·2	5·1	12·0	1·9	46·6	0·0
Longford,	2,448	24,327	8·3	11·0	8·4	0·0	3·2	2·4	19·3	8·8	48·8	0·4
Louth,	2,427	21,571	23·2	15·8	10·7	0·1	8·1	4·3	4·5	15·7	27·8	0·5
Meath,	2,521	24,881	9·0	8·8	5·6	—	4·1	4·6	22·6	2·9	48·0	0·0
Queen's,	2,186	20,382	19·6	15·9	9·1	—	5·4	8·3	11·3	2·0	39·3	0·2
Westmeath,	2,330	22,469	7·8	10·1	6·4	—	2·6	3·0	19·3	1·8	55·4	0·0
Wexford,	3,095	28,649	17·8	12·0	6·5	—	6·9	3·6	3·4	14·2	40·1	2·0
Wicklow,	1,228	11,952	8·9	8·9	5·6	—	4·3	7·9	12·4	4·6	51·0	2·0
Munster.												
Clare,	3,418	33,573	3·2	8·6	8·2	—	0·8	1·0	23·9	1·6	59·6	1·6
Cork,	4,872	43,921	8·9	10·7	6·9	0·0	4·3	2·6	9·0	8·6	51·5	4·4
Kerry,	3,142	35,813	4·1	7·7	5·7	—	0·9	1·7	12·0	3·4	43·5	26·7
Limerick,	2,357	22,581	3·3	7·0	4·5	—	1·1	1·3	25·5	1·8	59·2	0·8
Tipperary,	4,252	40,562	8·5	9·9	5·7	—	2·7	2·8	16·2	2·7	56·8	0·6
Waterford,	1,441	13,825	10·1	17·0	5·4	—	4·7	2·0	2·0	8·1	49·6	5·5
Ulster												
Antrim,	5,310	51,112	13·1	11·4	9·6	2·4	8·5	3·0	11·6	26·2	28·7	1·1
Armagh,	8,209	69,231	18·2	12·2	9·9	2·5	9·2	3·2	9·0	21·4	23·7	0·6
Cavan,	6,863	63,538	12·0	10·2	9·0	0·4	5·0	2·4	9·8	11·0	45·9	0·3
Donegal,	10,375	95,549	15·3	12·0	9·6	0·4	2·5	0·8	10·9	10·2	31·3	18·8
Down	5,615	51,343	19·5	12·8	10·0	2·9	10·1	2·6	2·0	35·9	12·9	1·5
Fermanagh,	3,301	32,285	6·3	6·6	6·0	0·1	1·4	1·0	23·7	4·0	55·9	1·0
Londonderry,	4,979	47,534	19·4	11·2	11·7	6·6	9·7	1·9	5·9	25·0	18·9	1·7
Monaghan,	7,122	69,452	18·3	10·5	8·8	1·0	8·4	2·0	6·8	31·1	15·9	0·2
Tyrone,	7,746	71,777	17·6	12·0	9·4	1·9	8·7	2·4	8·1	22·9	23·8	2·6
Connaught.												
Galway,	12,168	114,719	9·0	11·5	8·7	—	1·7	2·1	10·3	5·8	52·8	7·2
Leitrim,	5,213	53,507	4·0	7·3	6·2	0·0	0·2	0·8	22·5	2·9	61·4	0·9
Mayo,	15,010	146,458	10·7	11·3	9·8	0·0	2·2	2·3	7·7	8·2	50·4	7·2
Roscommon,	8,527	80,111	6·9	10·3	8·1	—	1·4	1·7	18·9	3·6	56·5	0·7
Sligo,	5,407	51,890	6·7	9·7	8·0	—	2·3	1·9	15·0	3·6	53·6	1·2
Summary.												
Leinster,	25,045	235,058	13·8	11·7	7·2	0·0	4·7	4·4	13·3	5·6	45·9	0·8
Munster,	19,282	190,275	6·4	9·5	5·9	0·0	2·3	2·0	15·2	4·2	53·3	7·1
Ulster,	82,550	534,971	16·1	11·7	9·4	1·7	7·0	2·1	8·8	21·3	27·5	3·8
Connaught,	48,355	446,685	8·4	10·5	8·5	0·0	1·7	1·9	13·0	5·6	54·3	4·8
Total of Ireland,	153,232	1,456,989	12·1	11·0	8·3	0·6	4·4	2·4	11·7	11·8	42·1	3·9

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XV.—Showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Number of each kind of Cattle on each Class of Holdings.

Counties.	Holdings. Above 200 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area.	Number of Cattle. Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle. Two Years Old and upwards.	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.	Total.	Above 100 and not exceeding 200 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area.	Number of Cattle. Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle. Two Years Old and upwards.	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.	Total.
	No	Acres	No.	No	No.	No	No	No	No.	Acres	No	No	No.	No	No.	No.
Leinster																
Carlow, ...	116	32 542	57	1,095	3,429	1,354	794	6,729	353	44,772	56	2,056	3,772	3,118	1,776	10,723
Dublin, ...	140	39 573	20	2,370	8,371	1,830	1 056	13,647	399	53,903	44	3,533	10,816	2 921	1,149	18,463
Kildare, ...	389	124 747	114	3,224	22,339	5,062	1,945	32,684	736	83 497	115	3 615	17,334	6 158	2 837	30,039
Kilkenny, ...	228	61,550	109	2,131	6,432	3,562	1,610	13,844	822	101,977	219	6,828	8,246	8,934	5 637	27,864
King's, ...	305	83,849	77	2,594	11,082	3,356	1,635	18,724	578	71,069	93	2 904	7 101	3,794	1 954	15,846
Longford, ...	73	13,916	21	438	2,798	1,445	284	4,986	195	23 573	31	814	3,807	1,824	736	7 262
Louth, ...	130	36,451	50	1,642	6,622	2,306	886	11,506	229	28 644	58	1,403	4,149	1,836	921	8,307
Meath, ...	655	210 470	133	5 365	70,033	10,121	3 117	88,769	921	130,096	71	3,968	37,437	7,365	2 732	51,503
Queen's, ...	284	78,209	100	2 064	7,086	3,875	1,903	15,528	606	76 929	142	3 775	6,583	4 502	2,816	17,818
Westmeath, ...	328	101,293	65	2,351	21 600	4,904	1,836	31,006	548	68 363	58	2,315	12,586	4 243	1,855	21,053
Wexford, ...	206	53,628	110	1,573	4,302	2,521	1,402	10,714	871	105 939	225	5 950	8 266	5,917	4,646	25,034
Wicklow, ...	362	142,224	112	2,642	5,066	2 834	1,710	12 364	719	80 342	196	4,900	6,599	4 555	3,212	19,462
Munster.																
Clare, ...	422	124 929	90	2,527	8,423	4,230	1,949	17,222	927	108 278	171	5,276	7,384	6 419	4,477	23,537
Cork, ...	817	206,141	493	13,157	9,945	7 479	7,541	35 615	3,380	394,186	1,550	44,278	15,991	19,225	27,303	108,347
Kerry, ...	699	195,009	363	7,439	6,174	4,794	4,696	23 406	1,792	193,690	660	15,612	6,868	8,173	12,140	40,453
Limerick, ...	262	76 444	208	4 667	9,145	4,771	2,569	21,360	1,039	129,185	634	17,675	10,017	8,972	10,409	47 707
Tipperary, ...	670	183,011	298	6,861	21,212	9,510	4,849	42 730	1,481	182 853	533	14,774	18,279	14,363	11 136	59 115
Waterford, ...	253	75 653	124	3,502	3,898	2,707	2,353	12,684	512	97,583	430	11,322	5,377	6,273	7,718	31,121
Ulster.																
Antrim, ...	210	39,755	91	2,115	1 582	2,538	809	7,435	524	64 136	219	4,970	2,850	2,980	2 458	13,347
Armagh, ...	20	4 718	9	116	327	162	59	673	99	11 438	48	650	1 057	831	471	3,057
Cavan, ...	75	15 411	31	617	845	573	388	2 454	224	25 240	61	1,382	2,178	1 646	897	6,144
Donegal	468	164,871	76	1,837	2 083	1 665	1 097	6,758	1,031	113,420	206	5,143	3,575	4,081	3 403	16,403
Down	104	34,920	57	1,130	1,245	1,132	613	4,227	334	39,447	159	3,212	2 491	2,962	1,837	10,661
Fermanagh, ...	89	24,010	26	651	1 038	784	451	2,950	353	40,304	73	2 653	2,064	1,862	1,647	8,299
Londonderry ...	176	61 553	58	1 334	1488	1,254	691	4,825	435	49,920	124	2,837	2,203	2,969	1,959	10,142
Monaghan, ...	25	5 822	18	310	680	366	125	1,499	109	12 224	38	718	1 133	809	399	3,087
Tyrone, ...	190	87 086	74	1,273	959	1,040	846	4,192	581	66,207	100	4,352	1,715	2,588	2,739	11,554
Connaught																
Galway, ...	1,014	350,108	86	4,219	21,274	7,435	2,686	35,700	1,214	146,356	47	3,210	13,450	5,799	2 141	24,647
Leitrim, ...	39	11,311	10	213	502	307	124	1,156	166	16,158	48	1,035	1 506	1,231	739	4,559
Mayo, ...	615	282,762	49	2,097	12,071	4,087	1,347	19,651	723	87,937	43	2,270	8,033	3,397	1,143	14,886
Roscommon, ...	287	78 558	37	1,363	9,642	4,354	990	16,386	532	69,093	38	1,798	8,538	5,154	1,144	16,672
Sligo, ...	157	51 761	37	924	2,949	2,672	782	7,364	314	38,002	35	1,296	4,237	3,186	961	9,715
Summary.																
Leinster, ...	3,224	983,542	974	28,389	169,340	43,220	18,078	260,501	6,976	879 104	1,306	42,361	126,496	53,157	30,324	253,674
Munster	3,075	861,217	1,586	38,153	58,809	33,551	23,987	156 077	9,341	1,105,760	3,983	111 938	63,916	63,330	73,203	316,370
Ulster, ...	1,357	467 646	440	9,433	10,547	9,514	5,079	35,013	3 690	422,836	1,088	25,947	19,266	20,723	15,850	82,379
Connaught, ...	2,115	774,500	219	8,816	46 438	18,255	5,929	80 257	2 949	357,546	211	9,609	35,764	18,767	6,128	70,479
Total of Ireland, ...	9,789	3,086 905	3,219	84 791	285 625	105 140	53 073	531,848	22,956	2 765,266	6,588	189,855	245,442	156,012	125,505	723,402

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

XV.—Showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the total Acreage of each Class, and the Number of each kind of Cattle on each Class of Holdings—*continued.*

Counties.	Holdings. Above 30 and not exceeding 100 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area.	Number of Cattle. Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle. Two Years Old and upwards.	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.	Total.	Above 30 and not exceeding 50 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area.	Number of Cattle. Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle. Two Years Old and upwards.	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.	Total.
Leinster.	No	Acres.	No.	No	No	No	No.	No	No.	Acres.	No	No	No	No	No.	No.
Carlow ...	846	55,122	78	3,796	3,294	3,883	3 037	11,138	849	30 688	17	2 656	1,497	2,111	2,106	8,387
Dublin, ...	625	41 032	92	4,158	5,962	2,535	1,668	14,415	596	21,875	21	2,663	2 281	1,530	941	7,436
Kildare, ...	956	65 465	58	2 985	9,627	4,346	2,600	19,611	824	30,673	15	1,569	3,924	2,356	1,528	9,692
Kilkenny, ...	2 119	133 919	271	12,958	8,876	9,888	10,759	40 752	2,203	81,101	100	9,552	3,398	8,450	7 762	27,292
King's, ...	1,239	78 536	50	4,225	5,819	4,795	3,161	18,050	1,476	50 539	25	3,592	2,847	3,046	2,618	12,128
Longford, ...	607	39 244	50	2,318	4 228	3,518	2,017	12,131	1,206	42 026	55	3,323	2 794	4 053	2,984	13,709
Louth ...	467	31,393	40	1,825	3,666	2,268	1,140	8 939	619	22,417	11	1 450	1,727	1,621	1,054	5,863
Meath, ...	1,215	80,931	66	3,652	19,454	6,724	3,026	32,922	1,192	44,570	33	2,525	7,940	4,177	2,231	18,906
Queen's, ...	1,266	80,177	117	5,405	5 313	5,438	4,361	20,634	1,316	47 673	34	3,980	2,388	3,074	3,213	12 689
Westmeath, ...	1,065	69,450	63	3,302	10 049	5,906	3,005	22,325	1,331	48 504	37	3,025	5,398	4,420	2,670	15,550
Wexford, ...	2,500	160,713	282	12,449	9,519	11,150	9 434	42,834	2,622	95,571	87	3,147	4,767	8,939	6,078	26,116
Wicklow, ...	1,305	90,211	160	6,964	5,323	5,241	4,590	22 287	1,131	38,533	57	3,596	2,179	3 011	2,339	11,182
Munster.																
Clare ...	2,791	168,792	211	15 073	8,129	12,373	12,635	48,421	3 645	128,576	236	15,448	4,444	10,011	12,962	43,101
Cork, ...	8,057	503,850	1,683	89,942	14,103	24,776	45,104	155,613	8,654	236,719	462	38,800	6,955	13,256	24,103	81,574
Kerry, ...	3,941	236,044	882	35,876	7,272	12,187	23,660	79,877	3,929	125,571	269	25,412	3 807	7,848	16,926	54,282
Limerick, ...	2,930	190,104	1,250	36,691	8 242	11,204	22,993	80,486	2,924	113,592	552	22,755	3,571	8,681	14,310	47,849
Tipperary ...	3,533	225,837	713	2,7307	13,210	19,637	21,577	83,049	3,929	149,566	331	21,752	8,754	13,174	17,531	59,575
Waterford ...	1,678	106,588	404	13,681	4,881	6,339	9 504	35,309	1,295	46,437	88	6,107	2,259	2 962	4,364	15,780
Ulster.																
Antrim, ...	2 372	155,650	564	17,245	4,831	7,840	9,540	40,020	3,617	131,783	304	17,390	3,382	7,428	10,646	39,210
Armagh, ...	567	33,875	198	2,981	2,223	3,450	2,018	10,880	1,432	49 844	203	5,371	2,227	4,579	3,759	16,139
Cavan ...	933	58,043	128	5 091	2,953	3,980	3,375	15,507	2424	82,768	148	10,225	3,073	5 698	6 904	26,048
Donegal ...	3,152	183 357	308	11,835	5,914	8,971	8,331	35,359	4,063	134,736	158	12,075	4,288	8,082	8,244	32,847
Down, ...	1,804	110,526	412	10,632	5,028	8,782	7,384	32,218	3,244	114,549	272	11,912	4,481	9,572	8 908	35,145
Fermanagh ...	1,508	79 664	210	8,238	2,780	3,345	5,638	20,209	2,359	83,476	126	11,289	1,893	3,316	7,966	24,590
Londonderry, ...	1,491	93,731	283	8,376	3,370	5,960	5,923	23,917	2,286	81,500	131	8,887	2,390	5,858	6,391	23,657
Monaghan ...	557	33,297	138	3,069	1,954	2,707	2,104	9,972	1,549	52,862	155	6,306	1,931	4,212	4,259	13,801
Tyrone, ...	2,534	152 826	390	14,579	3,465	7,741	10 346	36,521	4 079	142,142	252	16,504	3,133	8,239	11,468	39,594
Connaught.																
Galway, ...	2,332	143,944	93	4,956	11,126	6,946	3,381	26,502	3,897	131,652	72	7,193	7,573	7,956	5,013	27,807
Leitrim ...	666	40,791	102	3,540	2,643	3 072	2 403	11,760	1,792	63,270	107	7,826	2,515	3,785	5,568	19,782
Mayo, ...	1 612	97,839	98	4,202	8,555	5,098	2,598	20,551	3,019	100 655	100	7,303	6,396	6,426	4,772	25,057
Roscommon, ...	937	59,374	45	2,784	5,672	5,138	2,069	15,708	1,775	63,484	83	4,904	3,508	5,338	3,757	17,590
Sligo ...	782	48,149	75	3,092	4,289	4,112	2,378	13,026	1,584	54,339	68	5,602	2,626	4,064	4,324	16,684
Summary.																
Leinster, ...	14,500	926,193	1,322	64,037	89,130	65,692	48,857	269 038	15,365	555,463	492	46,878	41,240	42,818	35,522	166,950
Munster ...	22,928	1,431 215	5,153	198,570	56,443	87,116	132,473	482,755	22,436	800,561	1,971	128,274	27,788	53,912	90,196	302,141
Ulster, ...	14,718	900,669	2,631	82,046	32,528	52,736	54,662	224,603	25,053	873,555	1,747	99,959	26,798	57,042	68,543	254,089
Connaught, ...	6,329	390,097	413	13,574	32 265	24,366	12,829	83 447	12,067	413,400	430	32,828	22,618	27,810	23,431	105 920
Total of Ireland, ...	58,275	3,648,174	9,519	363,227	210,366	229,910	248,821	1,054,843	74,921	2 642,934	4,640	307,939	118,444	181,582	217,695	830,100

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XV.—Showing by Counties and Provinces the Number of Holdings above 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Total Acreage of each Class, and the Number of each kind of Cattle in each Class of Holdings—*continued.*

Counties.	Holdings: Above 15 and not exceeding 30 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area.	Number of Cattle: Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle: Two Years Old and upwards.	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.	Total.	Above 5 and exceeding not 15 Statute Acres. Number of Holdings.	Total Area.	Number of Cattle: Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle: Two Years Old and upwards.	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.	Total.
	No.	Acres	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	Acres	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Leinster																
Carlow, ...	955	19,693	4	1,825	813	1,385	1,321	5,348	830	7,568	13	772	233	551	532	2,131
Dublin, ...	909	18,201	35	2,191	1,535	1,290	1,119	6,170	1,641	12,551	13	1,878	619	912	942	4,364
Kildare, ...	1,130	22,616	12	1,827	2,416	1,623	1,509	7,387	1,685	14,831	13	1,642	951	1,020	1,233	4,859
Kilkenny, ...	2,444	50,063	44	6,102	1,894	4,628	4,667	17,535	2,413	24,615	14	2,714	752	2,197	2,127	7,804
King's, ...	2,104	42,616	7	3,611	2,106	2,834	2,622	11,180	2,265	21,262	42	2,310	731	1,328	1,606	6,017
Longford, ...	2,826	52,187	25	6,331	2,038	4,396	4,754	17,546	2,448	24,327	4	3,555	523	1,949	2,607	8,638
Louth, ...	1,389	28,117	27	2,388	1,597	2,047	1,751	7,810	2,427	21,571	8	2,442	713	1,449	1,599	6,211
Meath, ...	1,868	36,305	36	2,949	4,831	4,037	2,665	14,318	2,521	24,881	11	2,053	1,948	2,386	2,186	8,586
Queen's, ...	2,028	41,198	54	4,180	1,516	2,684	3,016	11,450	2,186	20,382	4	2,340	438	1,016	1,566	5,364
Westmeath, ...	2,169	43,807	18	3,639	3,755	4,474	3,425	15,309	2,336	22,469	3	2,483	1,313	2,188	2,123	8,110
Wexford, ...	2,990	81,315	34	5,913	3,347	5,105	4,136	18,535	3,095	28,646	16	3,244	1,331	2,588	2,039	9,218
Wicklow, ...	1,191	24,153	17	2,653	1,625	1,850	1,604	7,749	1,298	11,952	13	1,699	604	968	1,010	4,294
Munster.																
Clare, ...	4,792	92,426	42	14,379	3,167	9,115	11,943	38,646	3,418	33,573	18	5,193	991	3,217	4,411	13,830
Cork, ...	6,341	129,211	175	22,639	3,737	8,536	14,382	49,469	4,672	43,921	46	8,383	1,546	3,881	5,271	19,132
Kerry, ...	3,899	77,135	90	16,249	2,248	6,227	10,870	34,681	3,142	35,513	28	6,778	823	2,193	4,264	14,086
Limerick, ...	3,076	64,764	230	15,526	2,265	4,628	9,970	32,677	2,357	22,581	26	5,256	648	1,696	3,360	10,984
Tipperary, ...	4,799	101,226	174	16,653	4,337	10,161	13,337	44,662	4,252	40,262	82	6,737	1,775	4,313	5,161	18,068
Waterford, ...	1,388	28,470	89	3,674	1,445	1,870	2,617	9,645	1,441	13,825	18	2,105	717	1,060	1,445	5,345
Ulster.																
Antrim, ...	6,012	125,603	140	18,044	2,677	7,275	11,621	39,757	5,310	51,112	69	8,260	933	3,102	5,456	17,840
Armagh, ...	4,393	85,086	139	10,548	2,899	7,477	7,351	28,414	8,209	69,231	58	10,618	1,509	5,935	7,519	25,639
Cavan, ...	7,055	136,988	97	19,629	3,675	9,000	12,967	45,368	6,863	63,538	23	10,771	1,651	4,945	7,073	24,463
Donegal, ...	8,533	157,178	117	10,320	4,900	11,111	12,916	48,364	10,375	95,649	46	15,981	2,636	7,130	10,282	36,077
Down, ...	6,447	125,793	144	14,910	3,936	11,115	10,903	41,006	8,645	81,343	42	10,553	2,362	6,665	7,713	27,344
Fermanagh, ...	4,121	83,849	67	13,142	1,670	3,545	8,957	27,361	3,301	32,285	39	5,823	517	1,500	3,960	11,839
Londonderry, ...	4,518	89,639	66	11,787	2,770	8,603	8,113	29,339	4,979	47,584	18	8,010	1,117	3,493	5,263	17,900
Monaghan, ...	5,036	96,316	111	13,044	2,662	7,596	8,972	32,385	7,122	69,452	124	9,712	1,532	5,422	6,735	23,325
Tyrone, ...	7,513	156,356	171	21,408	3,377	10,080	14,791	49,827	7,746	74,777	49	11,543	1,342	5,475	8,250	26,659
Connaught.																
Galway, ...	9,290	180,319	102	14,625	8,470	12,499	10,593	46,289	12,168	114,719	52	13,976	4,337	6,767	10,214	37,346
Leitrim, ...	5,209	104,605	81	16,275	3,315	5,846	11,205	36,724	5,213	53,507	32	9,730	1,492	3,295	6,348	20,897
Mayo, ...	10,033	187,316	101	19,856	9,347	13,993	12,870	56,167	15,040	146,458	36	22,425	5,607	11,270	14,315	53,653
Roscommon, ...	6,124	106,390	90	13,693	3,946	9,761	10,326	37,816	8,527	80,111	26	11,897	1,722	6,129	8,948	28,722
Sligo, ...	4,454	94,695	62	12,133	2,739	5,426	9,443	29,803	5,407	61,890	27	9,258	986	3,329	6,977	20,577
Summary.																
Leinster, ...	21,803	442,271	311	43,589	27,273	36,355	32,789	140,317	25,045	235,053	154	27,132	10,356	18,584	19,570	75,796
Munster, ...	24,293	493,229	750	89,180	17,199	39,535	63,119	209,783	19,282	190,275	218	34,457	8,496	16,260	23,912	81,345
Ulster, ...	58,928	1,060,408	1,052	141,832	28,566	73,802	96,591	341,843	62,550	584,971	458	97,491	13,401	43,675	62,254	211,279
Connaught, ...	25,110	673,828	436	76,582	27,817	47,527	54,437	206,799	46,355	446,685	173	67,286	14,144	32,790	46,802	161,195
Total of Ireland, ...	135,134	2,669,738	2,549	351,183	100,855	197,219	246,936	898,742	153,232	1,456,969	1,013	220,366	44,399	111,309	152,538	529,625

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

XVI.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces as regards Holdings exceeding 5 Statute Acres in Extent, classified according to Size, the Percentage that the Number in each Class is of the Total Number; the Percentage the Acreage in each Class is of the Total Acreage; and the Percentage of the Total Number of each kind of Cattle that is on each Class of Holding.

APPENDIX IV.

Counties.	Holdings: Above 200 Statute Acres								Holdings: Above 100 and not exceeding 200 Statute Acres							
	Percentage of Total Holdings.	Percentage of Total Area.	Number of Cattle.						Percentage of Total Holdings.	Percentage of Total Area.	Number of Cattle.					
			Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle.			Total.			Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle.			Total.
					Two Years Old and upwards.	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.						Two Years Old and upwards.	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.	
Leinster																
Carlow,	2·9	17·1	25·3	6·9	26·3	10·9	8·3	14·2	9·0	23·5	24·9	16·9	28·9	25·1	18·5	22·7
Dublin	3·3	21·1	8·9	13·9	23·2	16·6	15·4	21·1	9·5	28·8	16·9	22·4	35·9	23·5	16·7	25·6
Kildare,	6·7	36·5	35·0	21·3	39·4	24·8	13·7	31·3	12·9	24·4	36·0	23·8	30·7	30·0	24·3	28·9
Kilkenny,	2·2	13·3	14·4	5·3	23·3	10·6	5·0	10·3	8·0	22·5	28·9	17·0	29·9	20·5	17·2	21·0
King's,	3·9	24·0	26·2	13·5	37·3	17·5	12·0	22·3	7·3	20·4	31·3	15·1	28·9	19·3	14·3	19·4
Longford,	1·1	9·4	11·3	2·5	17·3	8·4	2·1	7·9	2·7	11·3	13·7	4·7	25·5	10·3	5·9	11·3
Louth,	2·5	21·8	25·8	14·7	35·3	20·0	12·1	23·3	4·3	17·0	29·9	12·3	22·4	16·9	12·5	17·2
Meath,	7·9	39·8	38·0	26·2	49·6	29·0	19·5	41·7	11·0	24·6	20·2	19·6	26·4	21·1	17·1	24·2
Queen's,	3·7	22·7	22·1	11·9	30·4	18·9	10·2	13·8	7·9	22·3	31·5	18·6	23·2	21·9	18·6	21·4
Westmeath,	4·2	23·8	27·1	13·7	39·9	13·9	12·3	27·3	7·0	19·3	23·3	13·5	22·9	13·2	12·5	18·9
Wexford,	1·7	10·6	15·3	5·0	14·9	7·4	5·1	8·1	7·1	20·9	29·8	15·3	25·7	17·4	16·8	18·9
Wicklow,	5·9	35·8	20·2	11·8	23·7	15·4	11·8	13·0	11·8	22·7	35·3	21·3	30·8	24·7	22·2	25·2
Munster.																
Clare,	2·7	19·0	11·7	4·4	25·9	9·4	4·0	9·3	5·8	16·5	22·3	6·1	22·7	14·0	6·3	12·6
Cork,	2·7	13·8	11·2	6·7	19·0	9·7	3·1	8·5	11·3	26·1	35·1	22·7	30·3	24·9	22·0	24·0
Kerry,	4·0	22·6	15·9	3·7	22·3	11·9	3·1	9·2	9·9	22·4	23·6	16·9	25·2	20·2	16·6	13·3
Limerick,	2·0	12·8	7·2	4·5	27·0	12·6	4·0	8·9	8·3	21·6	21·9	17·2	29·6	23·8	10·4	19·8
Tipperary,	3·3	20·7	13·7	7·3	32·1	13·4	8·6	13·9	7·9	20·7	24·8	15·7	27·6	20·2	15·2	19·3
Waterford,	3·7	20·5	12·0	8·7	20·9	12·7	8·5	11·6	11·3	26·5	38·8	28·0	29·0	28·9	27·5	28·3
Ulster.																
Antrim,	1·2	14·5	6·5	3·1	11·4	3·1	1·9	4·7	2·9	10·4	15·3	7·3	17·2	9·3	8·2	8·9
Armagh,	0·1	1·9	1·4	0·4	3·2	0·8	0·3	0·8	0·6	4·5	7·3	2·1	10·3	3·7	2·2	3·3
Cavan,	0·4	4·0	6·4	1·3	5·9	2·2	1·2	2·1	1·3	3·6	12·5	2·9	15·1	6·4	2·8	5·1
Donegal,	1·7	19·4	8·4	2·8	8·7	4·1	2·5	3·9	3·7	13·4	22·6	7·8	15·4	9·6	7·7	6·3
Down,	0·5	6·8	5·3	2·3	3·4	2·8	1·6	2·3	1·3	7·7	14·8	6·1	12·3	7·4	4·8	7·1
Fermanagh,	0·4	7·0	4·8	1·3	10·4	5·4	1·6	3·1	3·1	11·3	13·5	8·3	20·7	13·0	5·8	8·7
Londonderry,	1·3	14·5	8·5	3·2	11·2	4·8	2·4	4·4	3·1	11·8	18·2	7·0	16·5	11·4	8·9	9·2
Monaghan,	0·2	2·2	3·1	0·9	7·0	1·7	0·5	1·7	0·7	4·5	6·5	2·2	11·7	3·6	1·6	9·5
Tyrone,	0·9	10·2	6·8	1·3	9·9	3·0	1·8	2·4	2·5	10·0	14·6	3·3	12·2	7·3	5·7	9·9
Connaught.																
Galway	3·4	32·8	19·0	3·7	32·1	15·1	7·9	17·9	4·1	13·7	10·4	6·7	20·3	11·7	9·3	12·4
Leitrim,	0·3	3·9	2·6	0·5	4·2	1·8	0·5	1·2	1·3	5·9	12·6	2·7	12·1	7·0	2·6	4·8
Mayo,	2·0	31·3	11·5	3·3	24·1	9·2	3·7	10·3	2·3	6·7	10·1	3·9	16·1	7·7	3·1	7·8
Roscommon,	1·5	17·2	11·9	3·7	29·2	12·1	3·8	12·4	2·9	15·1	11·9	4·9	25·9	14·4	4·2	12·9
Sligo,	1·2	15·3	12·2	2·8	13·6	11·7	3·1	7·5	2·5	11·2	11·5	4·0	23·8	14·0	3.6	9·6
Summary.																
Leinster	3·7	24·5	21·4	11·2	36·3	18·8	9·7	22·3	8·1	21·9	28·9	18·3	27·2	20·5	16·4	61·8
Munster	3·0	17·6	11·6	6·3	25·5	11·4	5·6	10·1	6·2	22·7	29·2	18·8	27·7	21·9	17·9	20·4
Ulster,	0·9	10·3	8·0	2·1	8·6	3·7	1·8	3·0	2·2	9·9	14·9	5·7	11·9	6·0	5·4	7·2
Connaught,	2·0	25·3	11·3	4·1	25·9	11·1	3·9	11·2	2·8	11·7	11·2	4·5	20·0	11·6	4·1	9·6
Total of Ireland,	2·2	19·0	11·7	5·8	28·4	10·7	5·1	11·6	5·1	17·0	23·9	12·5	24·4	15·6	12·0	15·8

rinted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

XVI.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces as regards Holdings exceeding 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Percentage that the Number in each Class is of the Total Number, the Percentage the Acreage in each Class is of the Total Acreage; and the Percentage of the Total Number of each kind of Cattle that is on each Class of Holding—*continued.*

Counties.	Holdings. Above 50 and not exceeding 100 Statute Acres. Percentage of Total Holdings	Percentage of Total Area.	Number of Cattle. Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf)	Other Cattle. Two Years Old and upwards	One Year Old and under Two Years	Under One Year	Total.	Above 30 and not exceeding 50 Statute Acres. Percentage of Total Holdings	Percentage of Total Area.	Number of Cattle. Bulls.	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf)	Other Cattle. Two Years Old and upwards	One Year Old and under Two Years.	Under One Year.	Total
Leinster.																
Carlow,	21·4	29·0	34·7	31·1	25·3	31·2	32·1	29·8	21·5	16·1	7·5	21·8	11·5	17·0	21·9	17·6
Dublin,	14·8	21·9	40·9	24·3	20·2	23·0	24·2	22·3	14·2	11·7	9·3	15·6	7·7	13·9	13·7	11·5
Kildare,	18·8	19·2	18·4	19·7	17·0	21·1	22·3	18·9	14·4	9·0	4·8	12·3	7·0	11·4	13·1	9·2
Kilkenny,	20·7	29·5	35·7	32·2	24·9	29·3	32·9	30·1	21·6	17·9	13·2	23·7	12·3	19·2	23·6	20·3
King's,	15·6	22·8	17·0	21·9	19·6	25·1	23·3	22·0	18·5	14·6	8·5	18·7	9·8	15·9	19·8	14·8
Longford,	8·5	19·6	26·9	13·4	26·1	20·5	15·0	18·9	16·9	21·0	29·6	22·1	17·3	23·8	22·2	21·3
Louth,	8·9	18·8	20·6	16·4	19·9	19·7	15·5	18·4	11·8	13·3	5·7	13·0	9·4	14·1	14·3	12·0
Meath,	14·5	15·3	18·9	17·8	13·8	19·3	19·0	15·4	14·2	8·4	9·5	12·3	5·7	12·0	14·6	7·9
Queen's,	18·5	23·3	26·0	24·2	22·8	26·4	26·0	24·7	17·1	13·8	7·5	17·8	10·2	14·9	19·1	15·2
Westmeath,	13·7	19·8	26·3	19·3	18·2	22·7	20·2	19·7	17·1	13·7	15·4	17·7	9·8	16·9	17·9	13·7
Wexford,	20·4	31·8	37·1	35·1	29·6	32·5	34·0	32·3	21·3	19·1	11·4	21·7	15·2	20·3	21·9	19·7
Wicklow,	22·9	22·7	28·8	31·0	24·9	28·4	31·8	28·8	18·6	9·7	10·3	18·0	10·2	16·3	16·1	14·5
Munster.																
Clare,	17·5	25·7	27·5	26·0	25·0	27·3	26·1	26·2	22·8	19·6	26·7	19·6	13·7	22·1	26·8	23·3
Cork,	26·9	33·3	38·2	35·8	27·0	32·1	36·5	34·4	22·3	15·8	18·9	14·7	13·3	17·2	19·5	18·0
Kerry,	22·8	27·3	38·4	32·5	26·8	30·1	32·7	31·6	22·7	14·6	23·0	17·6	14·0	19·4	23·3	21·5
Limerick,	23·5	31·8	43·1	35·8	24·3	29·8	36·1	33·4	22·6	19·8	22·2	12·2	10·5	17·6	22·5	19·8
Tipperary,	18·9	25·8	33·0	29·1	20·9	27·6	29·3	27·0	21·4	16·9	23·1	14·8	10·2	18·5	23·8	19·4
Waterford,	24·4	23·9	36·3	33·9	28·3	31·4	33·9	32·1	18·9	12·0	15·1	12·4	12·2	13·7	15·6	14·4
Ulster.																
Antrim,	13·2	25·2	40·7	25·3	29·2	25·1	23·5	25·4	20·1	21·3	21·9	25·6	20·4	24·0	26·2	24·8
Armagh,	3·9	13·3	30·2	9·8	21·8	15·4	9·8	12·8	9·7	19·8	31·0	17·8	21·7	20·4	17·7	19·0
Cavan,	5·3	15·2	26·2	10·7	20·5	15·3	10·7	12·9	13·8	21·7	30·3	21·4	21·4	22·1	21·9	21·7
Donegal,	11·4	21·5	38·3	17·9	25·3	21·8	18·8	20·1	14·7	15·9	17·4	18·2	18·3	19·7	18·8	19·7
Down,	8·8	21·7	38·0	20·3	25·7	21·8	19·8	21·4	15·8	22·5	25·0	22·7	22·9	23·8	23·9	23·3
Fermanagh,	11·3	23·1	38·7	19·7	27·9	23·3	19·7	21·2	20·5	24·3	23·3	27·0	19·0	23·1	27·8	25·8
Londonderry,	10·8	22·1	41·6	20·3	25·3	22·8	20·9	21·8	16·4	19·2	19·3	21·5	17·9	22·4	22·5	21·5
Monaghan,	3·9	12·3	23·7	9·3	20·2	12·8	9·3	11·4	10·7	19·8	26·3	19·0	19·9	20·0	18·9	19·4
Tyrone,	11·0	23·2	35·5	20·9	24·8	22·0	21·3	21·7	17·8	21·5	23·0	23·7	22·3	23·4	23·7	23·6
Connaught.																
Galway,	7·8	13·5	20·6	10·3	16·8	14·1	9·9	13·4	13·0	12·3	15·9	14·9	11·8	16·1	14·7	14·0
Leitrim,	5·1	14·1	26·9	9·2	22·1	17·5	9·1	12·4	13·7	21·8	28·2	20·3	21·0	21·5	21·1	20·9
Mayo,	5·2	10·8	22·9	7·2	17·1	11·5	7·0	10·8	9·7	11·2	23·4	12·8	12·8	14·6	12·9	13·2
Roscommon,	5·2	13·0	14·1	7·6	17·2	14·3	7·6	11·8	9·8	13·9	26·0	13·5	10·6	14·9	13·8	13·2
Sligo,	6·1	14·2	24·7	9·6	24·0	18·0	9·5	14·2	12.5	16·0	22·3	17·4	14·7	17·8	17·4	17·0
Summary.																
Leinster,	16·5	23·0	29·0	25·4	19·2	25·3	26·4	23·1	17·7	13·8	10·8	18·8	8·9	16·5	19·2	14·3
Munster,	22·6	29·3	37·7	33·3	24·5	29·6	33·1	31·2	22·2	16·4	14·4	21·3	12·0	18·4	22·0	18·5
Ulster,	9·1	20·9	35·4	18·2	20·1	20·5	18·1	19·5	15·6	20·3	23·5	22·2	35·3	22·1	22·8	22·2
Connaught,	6·0	12·8	21·9	8·7	18·0	14·3	8·6	12·3	11·5	13·5	22·9	15·4	12·7	16·3	15·7	15·0
Total of Ireland,	12·8	22·4	34·8	23·9	21·0	23·4	24·0	23·3	16·5	16·2	16·9	20·3	11·8	18·5	20·8	18·1

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

VI.—Statement showing by Counties and Provinces as regards Holdings exceeding 5 Statute Acres in Extent, Classified according to Size, the Percentage that the Number in each Class is of the Total Number; the Percentage the Acreage in each Class is of the Total Acreage; and the Percentage of the Total Number of each kind of Cattle that is on each Class of Holding—*continued.*

Counties	Holdings: Above 15 and not exceeding 30 Statute Acres								Holdings: Above 5 and not exceeding 15 Statute Acres							
	Percentage of Total Holdings.	Percentage of Total Area.	Number of Cattle.						Percentage of Total Holdings	Percentage of Total Area	Number of Cattle					
			Bulls	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf)	Other Cattle.			Total.			Bulls	Milch Cows (including Heifers in Calf).	Other Cattle			Total.
					Two Years Old and upwards	One Year Old and under Two Years	Under One Year						Two Years Old and upwards	One Year Old and under Two Years	Under One Year.	
Leinster																
Carlow	24·2	10·3	1·2	15·0	6·2	11·1	13·7	11·2	21·0	4·0	5·8	6·3	1·8	4·7	5·5	4·5
Dublin	21·3	9·7	15·5	12·3	5·2	11·7	16·3	9·5	33·8	8·7	5·8	11·0	2·8	8·3	13·7	7·0
Kildare	19·3	6·6	4·0	12·1	4·2	7·9	13·0	7·0	29·4	4·3	4·0	10·8	1·7	5·0	10·3	4·7
Kilkenny	23·9	11·1	5·9	15·1	6·8	13·8	14·9	12·3	23·8	5·4	1·9	6·7	2·3	6·8	6·4	3·0
King's	28·3	12·3	2·4	13·3	7·1	14·8	19·3	13·6	28·4	6·1	14·3	12·0	2·5	8·9	11·8	7·4
Longford	36·7	26·1	13·4	36·7	12·6	25·6	35·4	27·3	34·1	12·1	2·1	20·6	3·2	11·3	19·4	13·4
Louth	26·4	16·7	13·9	21·4	8·6	17·7	23·8	18·0	46·1	12·8	4·1	21·9	3·9	12·6	21·8	12·8
Meath	22·3	7·2	10·3	14·4	3·2	11·7	18·8	6·8	30·1	4·7	3·1	10·0	1·3	8·9	13·6	4·0
Queen's	26·4	12·0	12·0	18·7	3·5	13·0	13·0	13·7	28·4	5·9	0·9	10·5	1·9	5·0	9·3	6·4
Westmeath	28·0	12·4	6·7	21·3	3·8	17·0	22·9	15·5	30·0	8·4	1·2	14·5	2·4	8·3	14·2	7·2
Wexford	24·3	12·1	4·5	15·8	10·4	14·9	14·9	14·0	25·2	5·7	2·1	8·6	4·2	7·5	7·3	7·0
Wicklow	19·5	6·1	3·1	11·8	7·8	10·0	11·1	10·0	21·3	3·0	2·3	7·8	2·8	5·2	7·0	5·5
Munster																
Clare	29·9	14·1	5·5	24·8	9·7	20·1	24·7	20·9	21·8	5·1	2·3	9·0	3·0	7·1	9·1	7·5
Cork	21·2	8·5	4·0	11·3	7·1	11·1	11·8	10·9	15·8	2·9	1·0	4·3	3·0	5·0	4·3	4·2
Kerry	22·5	8·9	3·9	14·7	8·2	13·0	14·9	13·6	18·1	4·2	1·2	8·2	3·0	5·4	5·9	5·8
Limerick	24·7	10·8	7·9	15·2	8·7	12·2	15·7	13·6	18·9	8·7	0·9	5·1	1·9	4·2	5·3	4·5
Tipperary	25·7	11·5	8·0	17·7	6·5	14·3	18·1	14·5	22·8	4·8	3·8	7·1	2·7	8·0	7·0	5·9
Waterford	20·2	7·7	3·5	9·1	7·7	8·6	9·3	8·6	21·0	3·8	1·0	5·2	3·9	4·7	5·2	4·8
Ulster																
Antrim	33·3	20·3	10·1	26·5	16·2	23·3	28·7	25·2	29·3	8·8	5·0	12·2	5·6	9·9	13·5	11·3
Armagh	29·9	33·5	21·2	34·6	28·3	33·4	34·7	33·4	55·8	27·2	8·9	35·5	14·7	26·3	35·5	30·4
Down	40·1	35·9	19·9	41·1	25·6	34·9	41·0	37·8	39·1	13·6	4·7	22·6	11·5	19·1	22·4	20·4
Donegal	30·9	18·5	12·8	29·2	21·0	27·1	29·2	27·8	37·8	11·3	5·0	24·1	11·3	17·4	23·2	20·5
Fermanagh	31·3	25·8	13·3	28·5	20·1	27·8	29·2	27·2	42·0	16·0	3·3	20·1	12·1	18·3	20·7	18·2
Londonderry	35·7	24·4	12·4	31·5	16·8	24·7	31·3	25·8	28·6	9·4	7·3	13·9	5·2	10·5	13·8	12·4
Monaghan	32·5	21·2	9·7	28·8	20·8	25·2	28·7	26·8	35·9	11·2	2·7	19·4	8·3	13·4	18·3	16·3
Tyrone	35·0	35·7	19·1	39·3	27·5	36·0	39·7	37·2	49·5	25·7	21·3	29·5	13·7	25·7	29·8	26·8
	34·0	23·8	15·6	30·7	24·1	28·7	30·5	29·8	33·8	11·3	4·5	18·6	9·7	15·6	17·0	15·8
Connaught																
Galway	31·0	16·9	22·8	30·4	12·7	25·3	31·2	23·3	40·7	10·8	11·5	29·0	6·5	17·7	30·0	19·0
Leitrim	39·3	36·1	21·3	42·1	27·7	33·4	42·5	38·7	39·3	18·5	8·4	25·2	12·9	18·8	24·0	22·0
Mayo	32·3	20·8	23·7	34·1	18·7	31·6	34·7	29·6	48·5	16·2	8·4	38·6	11·2	25·4	33·6	28·3
Roscommon	33·6	23·3	28·2	37·8	11·9	27·2	37·9	28·4	46·9	17·5	8·2	32·7	5·2	17·1	32·9	21·3
Sligo	35·1	28·0	20·4	37·5	15·4	23·3	38·0	30·4	42·6	15·3	8·9	28·7	5·5	14·7	28·1	21·0
Summary																
Leinster	25·1	11·0	6·8	17·3	5·9	14·0	17·7	12·0	28·9	5·3	3·4	10·7	2·2	7·1	10·8	8·5
Munster	24·0	10·1	5·5	14·8	7·5	13·5	15·4	13·5	19·0	3·9	1·8	5·7	2·8	5·5	5·8	5·3
Ulster	33·4	24·8	14·1	31·5	17·8	28·7	31·2	29·8	38·8	13·6	8·4	20·3	8·3	17·0	20·7	18·3
Connaught	33·5	22·1	23·2	35·8	15·5	28·0	36·4	29·0	44·2	14·6	9·2	31·5	7·9	19·3	31·3	22·8
Total of Ireland	29·7	16·4	9·2	23·2	10·0	20·1	23·5	19·8	33·7	9·0	3·7	14·5	4·4	11·4	14·6	11·8

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

B.—Table showing the Number of various classes of Agricultural Holdings in Ireland in 1841 and certain subsequent years.

The earliest official statistics relating to the number of various-sized holdings in each county are those contained in the Census of 1841.

Similar figures were given in the Census Returns of 1851. Between these two dates the annual collection of Agricultural Statistics was started, and these figures are available for 1847 and each subsequent year. The figures given below are taken from the Census Returns of 1841 and 1851 and the Agricultural Statistics for 1847, 1857, 1867, 1877, 1887, 1897, and 1906. These figures were all collected on the same basis and are therefore comparable; they include many holdings not strictly agricultural.

No statistics relating to holdings were collected for the Census in 1861 and 1871, as they were regarded as unnecessary, in view of the fact that the agricultural statistics were annually collected. During the Census of 1881 the collection of statistics relating to holdings was resumed, but on a new basis, and a different interpretation placed upon the word "holdings" (see explanatory note, page vii., in the prefatory note to the statistics contained in the second appendix to the Seventh Report of the Commission). To put the matter briefly, the Census figures relate to landholders and not to holdings; the Agricultural Statistics relate to holdings and include many that are not agricultural. The result is that the figures given in the Agricultural Statistics are, roughly, 20 per cent. greater than those given in the Census Returns since 1881.

WALTER CALLAN,

Secretary.

4th April, 1908

1.—Table showing, as regards Holdings under 1 acre in extent, the number of such Holdings in certain counties of Ireland from the year 1841.

County.	YEARS.								
	1841.* (1.)	1847. (2.)	1851. (3.)	1857. (4.)	1867 (5.)	1877. (6.)	1887. (7.)	1897. (8.)	1906. (9.)
Donegal, ..	*	2,390	654	646	1,186	1,056	1,263	1,520	1,468
Sligo, ..	*	965	424	444	1,000	1,201	710	951	913
Leitrim, ..	*	775	644	568	671	618	412	541	846
Mayo, ..	*	2,341	1,020	1,451	2,326	1,830	1,635	1,952	1,840
Roscommon, ..	*	2,537	1,642	1,691	1,578	1,111	863	878	1,202
Galway, ..	*	4,272	2,543	2,810	2,848	2,387	1,744	1,994	2,227
Kerry, ..	*	2,271	507	626	1,085	868	982	1,634	2,622
Clare, ..	*	3,088	920	1,176	1,235	1,355	1,167	1,464	1,791
Total, ..	—	18,639	8,354	9,412	11,929	10,426	8,776	10,934	12,909
Total for all Ireland, ..	—	73,016	37,728	37,442	50,670	51,910	48,122	62,189	80,693

* There are no official statistics available to show the number of holdings under one acre in extent in the year 1841.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

2.—TABLE showing, as regards Holdings from 1–5 acres in extent, the number of such Holdings in certain counties in Ireland from the year 1841.

COUNTY.	YEARS.								
	1841. (1.)	1847. (2.)	1851. (3.)	1857. (4.)	1867. (5.)	1877. (6.)	1887. (7.)	1897. (8.)	1906. (9.)
Donegal, ..	15,567	4,212	3,297	3,371	3,108	2,737	2,719	2,922	2,926
Sligo, ..	11,291	3,084	1,867	1,924	1,639	1,461	1,410	1,442	1,477
Leitrim, ..	9,373	2,266	1,188	1,298	1,193	979	838	856	872
Mayo, ..	33,790	10,349	4,959	4,584	5,546	4,620	3,516	3,503	3,436
Roscommon, ..	17,472	7,124	3,739	3,389	3,066	2,524	2,188	2,066	2,176
Galway, ..	27,992	12,774	6,710	6,263	6,214	5,241	4,509	4,672	4,297
Kerry, ..	8,689	2,654	942	1,268	1,266	1,203	1,411	1,794	2,199
Clare, ..	11,593	4,713	1,642	1,669	1,601	1,375	1,246	1,388	1,496
Total, ..	135,767	47,176	24,344	23,766	23,633	20,140	17,837	18,643	18,879
Total for all Ireland,..	306,915	139,041	88,083	81,585	78,064	66,637	60,824	62,030	62,256

3.—TABLE showing the number of Holdings from 5–15 acres in extent in certain counties in Ireland from the year 1841.

COUNTY.	YEARS.								
	1841. (1.)	1847. (2.)	1851. (3.)	1857. (4.)	1867. (5.)	1877. (6.)	1887. (7.)	1897. (8.)	1906. (9.)
Donegal, ..	12,931	13,043	11,610	10,947	11,643	10,812	10,277	10,161	10,409
Sligo, ..	6,190	8,895	5,839	6,102	5,976	6,034	5,842	5,781	5,442
Leitrim, ..	7,971	8,789	6,018	6,110	5,933	5,458	5,194	5,128	5,190
Mayo, ..	10,331	23,581	15,301	14,894	15,666	16,050	14,947	15,274	15,334
Roscommon, ..	8,066	13,705	9,291	8,770	8,671	8,588	8,243	8,211	8,544
Galway, ..	12,663	21,565	12,806	12,321	12,523	12,703	12,251	12,243	12,257
Kerry, ..	10,830	5,844	2,777	2,438	2,699	2,782	2,943	3,202	3,205
Clare, ..	12,049	11,018	3,908	3,745	3,398	3,211	3,063	3,135	3,326
Total, ..	81,031	106,440	67,550	65,327	66,509	65,638	62,760	63,135	63,707
Total for all Ireland,..	251,128	269,534	191,854	179,733	173,475	164,917	156,562	155,064	154,228

4.—TABLE showing, as regards Holdings from 15–30 acres in extent, the number of such Holdings in certain counties in Ireland from the year 1841.

COUNTY.	YEARS.								
	1841. (1.)	1847. (2.)	1851. (3.)	1857. (4.)	1867. (5.)	1877. (6.)	1887. (7.)	1897. (8.)	1906. (9.)
Donegal, ..	3,257	9,067	8,857	8,559	8,383	8,411	8,513	8,413	8,562
Sligo, ..	705	4,150	3,936	4,252	4,482	4,578	4,488	4,494	4,455
Leitrim, ..	877	4,728	4,865	4,871	4,931	5,314	5,230	5,241	5,282
Mayo, ..	1,265	9,877	8,159	8,855	8,431	9,452	9,660	9,612	9,783
Roscommon, ..	913	4,519	4,503	5,244	5,291	5,462	5,513	5,502	6,079
Galway, ..	2,030	10,470	7,336	8,101	8,556	8,728	8,557	8,837	9,159
Kerry, ..	4,068	6,345	3,996	3,737	3,750	3,761	3,698	3,827	3,959
Clare, ..	2,234	8,035	5,290	4,918	4,753	4,748	4,632	4,656	4,604
Total, ..	15,619	57,191	46,942	48,537	48,577	50,454	50,311	50,582	52,083
Total for all Ireland,..	78,954	164,337	141,311	139,193	136,503	137,791	134,879	133,308	135,133

rinted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

5.—TABLE showing, as regards Holdings from 30–200 acres in extent, the number of such Holdings in certain counties in Ireland from the year 1841.

COUNTY.	YEARS.						
	1851.* (1.)	1857. (2.)	1867. (3.)	1877. (4.)	1887. (5.)	1897. (6.)	1906. (7.)
Donegal, ...	7,875	7,858	7,386	8,028	8,183	8,308	5,224
Sligo, ...	2,534	2,484	2,482	2,592	2,621	2,741	2,689
Leitrim, ...	2,387	2,516	2,409	2,496	2,624	2,661	2,626
Mayo, ...	4,703	5,766	4,188	4,413	5,194	5,398	5,389
Roscommon, ...	2,447	2,992	2,618	3,073	3,100	3,149	3,258
Galway, ...	5,967	7,043	6,071	7,131	7,215	7,373	7,354
Kerry, ...	8,752	8,934	8,601	9,470	9,222	9,327	9,484
Clare, ...	6,264	6,586	6,257	7,266	7,350	7,303	7,369
Total, ...	40,929	44,449	40,012	44,469	45,509	46,260	43,393
Total for all Ireland, ...	139,786	146,535	134,321	151,032	153,201	154,576	155,417

* The year 1851 was the first year in which holdings over 30 acres in extent were classified according to acreage.

6.—TABLE showing, as regards Holdings exceeding 200 acres in extent, the number of such Holdings in certain counties in Ireland from the year 1841.

COUNTY.	YEARS						
	1851.* (1.)	1857. (2.)	1867. (3.)	1877. (4.)	1887. (5.)	1897. (6.)	1906. (7.)
Donegal, ...	459	454	468	451	438	449	420
Sligo, ...	156	161	203	154	158	157	162
Leitrim, ...	57	54	82	54	44	47	42
Mayo, ...	668	751	656	631	728	656	622
Roscommon, ...	279	287	288	285	303	292	282
Galway, ...	909	1,113	984	1,142	1,045	1,039	762
Kerry, ...	736	784	869	741	742	715	691
Clare, ...	395	410	485	392	394	399	421
Total, ...	3,709	4,014	4,035	3,850	3,847	3,754	3,402
Total for all Ireland,	9,304	9,848	11,497	9,676	9,887	9,808	9,617

* The year 1851 was the first year in which holdings above 30 acres in extent were classified according to acreage

7.—SUMMARY showing the total number of Holdings in certain counties in Ireland from the year 1841

COUNTY.	YEARS.								
	1841. (1.)	1847. (2.)	1851. (3.)	1857. (4.)	1867. (5.)	1877. (6.)	1887. (7.)	1897. (8.)	1906. (9.)
Donegal, ..	33,724	37,567	32,752	31,835	32,386	31,495	31,393	31,773	32,009
Sligo, ..	18,584	19,466	14,756	15,367	15,985	16,020	15,224	15,566	15,138
Leitrim, ..	18,423	19,082	15,159	15,417	15,233	14,919	14,342	14,474	14,858
Mayo, ..	46,521	53,164	34,810	36,301	37,329	36,996	35,700	36,395	36,404
Roscommon, .	27,346	30,641	21,901	22,373	21,938	21,043	20,210	20,098	21,541
Galway, .	44,330	58,448	36,271	37,651	38,451	37,331	35,321	36,158	36,256
Kerry, ..	25,759	27,590	17,760	17,787	18,633	18,825	18,998	20,499	22,160
Clare, ..	26,928	32,902	18,419	18,774	18,519	18,347	17,852	18,345	19,207
Total, ..	241,615	278,860	191,828	195,505	198,474	194,976	189,040	193,308	197,573
Total for all Ireland, ..	685,309	803,025	608,066	594,332	597,118	581,963	563,475	576,975	597,344

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

C.—MEMORANDUM ON THE FINANCIAL ASPECT OF THE RELIEF OF DISTRESS IN IRELAND.

Origin of inquiry.

The Rev. Denis O'Hara, a member of the Congested Districts Board, during the course of his examination on the 2nd October last, referred to the amount of money that had been spent on the relief of distress in the West in the last quarter of a century, and expressed the opinion that the expenditure of a somewhat similar sum of money now, properly administered, would almost effect a radical cure of the chronic poverty of the West. (See Question 3618 *et seq.*)* A desire was expressed that official information should be obtained on the point, and with this object the Secretary of the Commission wrote to the Chief Secretary's Office, the Board of Works, the Local Government Board, the Irish Land Commission, and the Department of Agriculture, asking them to give all available information they could, showing the amount advanced by way of grant and loan for the relief of distress since 1878. Information was also sought respecting the source from which the funds came and the body upon which, in the case of loan, liability for repayment fell. It was requested that a distinction should be drawn as far as possible between the money expended in the congested districts and elsewhere, and also between the money expended on reproductive purposes, and that spent on measures of temporary alleviation.

Financial complications.

Replies were received from all the bodies mentioned giving much detailed information which, however, it is not easy to summarise. The financial details are necessarily complicated; some advances were free grants, others were loans. The repayment of part of some loans was remitted, and such sums as were remitted may be regarded as free grants. Again, loans were made on varying terms. Some were at the ordinary rates of interest, some were free of interest, others carried only nominal interest; in some cases the interest was defrayed out of Imperial, in some cases out of Irish funds. Such transactions have a double aspect, and have to be considered as in part free grants, and in part loans. Again, some loans were secured on private property, and some on local rates, and in some cases the rates were to be recouped by the persons to whom the loans were made. In some cases the cost of administration, at any rate in part, came out of the advances; in other cases, this item of expenditure was chargeable to other services.

Relief of distress and reproductive works.

Again, it is not easy to distinguish how far the exact object of certain advances was temporary alleviation or something more. The term "Relief of Distress" is generally understood to refer to the immediate alleviation of exceptional and acute distress, and not to the amelioration of chronic poverty. Providing food and clothes, and supplying seed potatoes were obviously measures of temporary relief, and so also probably were works undertaken where more attention was paid to the amount of employment they would temporarily afford than to how far they would prove reproductive. Assistance to emigrants and the cancellation of arrears are not, however, so easily classified. Moreover many reproductive works, *e.g.*, light railways and harbour works, were utilised to give employment during periods of distress, and as works which tended to relieve chronic poverty necessarily tended also to relieve, as it were by anticipation, exceptional and acute distress, it is obviously difficult to draw a rigid line of demarcation.

Expenditure in Congested Districts.

Further, it is practically impossible to distinguish between money spent in the congested districts and elsewhere. The general unit of administration for the relief of distress was the Union; the unit of congestion is the Electoral Division; few Unions in the administrative counties containing congested districts are wholly congested or wholly non-congested; and, it must also be remembered, that most of the money referred to below was expended before a legal meaning was attached to the term "Congested Districts." Undoubtedly the bulk of the money expended since 1891 has been spent in the congested districts.

Administration.

Owing, moreover, to the fact that money was advanced under a number of different Acts, which, being framed to meet special emergencies, did not proceed upon uniform lines, and owing to the fact that frequently two or three Departments were concerned in the same loan or grant, the difficulty of giving a clear and comprehensive statement of expenditure is very much increased. The Board of Works handled most of the money. In some cases, *e.g.*, improvement of land, everything connected with the loan or grant was in their hands; in other cases, *e.g.*, Seed Supply Acts and Relief of Distress Acts, their function was confined to making an advance on the recommendation of the Local Government Board, and subsequently obtaining repayment in the case of loans. The Land Commission were concerned in these transactions as the body managing the Irish Church Temporalities Fund, and they had the control of most of the expenditure under the Arrears of Rent Act. With this exception the Board of Works managed the finance of money expended on the relief of distress up to 1890; the Local Government Board doing most of the administration with certain help from the Land Commission in seed supply operations. From 1890 to 1895 the finance was largely worked from the Chief Secretary's Office, and since 1896 the Local Government Board has been the body chiefly concerned. In most of the reproductive works, *e.g.*, light railways, the Board of Works have been solely concerned. The Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction were concerned with the relief of distress only in 1905, when they contributed a sum of £9,500 towards the supply of seed and assisted in the inspection of seed at the port of despatch.

Expenditure, 1880–2.

The Irish Government state that the total outlay on operations for the relief of distress consequent on the failure of the potato crop in 1879, and the exceptionally severe winter of 1880 was £2,562,476 (inclusive of a sum of £267,000 distributed in food and clothing by different charitable organisations). It is not easy to obtain full particulars of this expenditure. Under the Relief of Distress (Ireland) Acts, 1880, £1,250,863 12*s.* 7*d.* was advanced on loan out of the Church Temporalities Fund, the rates of interest charged being 1 per cent (see Table VI., col. 2, line 1); and a free grant of £19,069 3*s.* 0*d.* was made out of the same source, and was expended on food and fuel (see Table I., col. 10, line 3, and Table VI., col. 3, line 1). Of the money lent, £893,977 3*s.* 6*d.* had been repaid up to 31st March, 1905, and £21,151 3*s.* 4*d.* had been written off, leaving a balance due of £335,735 0*s.* 9*d.*, of which £6,238 1*s.* 9*d.* is regarded as irrecoverable.

The money advanced on loan was made up as follows:—

(1.) £923,620 was advanced for the improvement of lands, and the repayment was charged on the lands so improved. Of this sum, the repayment of £21,275 has been remitted, and consequently that figure may be regarded as a free grant (see Table I., col. 4, line 1), and £902,345 as a loan (see Table II., col. 6, line 1).

(2.) £271,189 was advanced for baronial works, repayment of which was charged on local rates. £7 of this sum was subsequently remitted, and consequently may be regarded as a free grant (See Table I., col. 4, line 2); and £271,182 as a loan (see Table II., col. 5, line 2).

* See Appendix to the First Report of the Commission [Cd. 3267, 1906], p. 156.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

(3.) £6,136 was advanced for arterial drainage, repayment being charged on private property. Of this, £716 was subsequently remitted, and may therefore be regarded as a free grant (see Table I., col. 4, line 3) and £5,420 as a loan. (See Table II., col. 6, line 4).

(4.) £38,536 was advanced for public health purposes, repayment being charged on the local rates (see Table II., col. 5, line 3).

(5.) £11,384 was advanced to the Boards of Guardians for relief purposes, the repayment being charged on local rates. (See Table II., col. 11, line 6). A sum of £15,756 was advanced out of Imperial funds (for providing food and clothing), at the ordinary rate of interest repayment being charged on local rates; £10,856 was subsequently made a charge against the Irish Church Fund (the interest being reduced to 1 per cent.), and is included in the above-mentioned item of £11,384 (see Table II., col 11, line 6); consequently the net loan made out of the Imperial funds at the ordinary rate of interest and charged on the local rates, was £4,900. (See Table V., col. 11, line 2).

Under one of the same Relief Acts a free grant of £48,202 was made from Imperial funds (see Table I., col. 3, line 12) for the construction of piers and harbours in the West of Ireland, one-fourth of the cost of each work being provided from other sources. £16,015 was thus spent out of charitable funds (see Table I., col 7, line 12).

Under the Seed Supply Act of 1880, £647,562 was lent out of Imperial funds free of interest, but recoverable from the persons to whom the seed was supplied, the repayment being charged on local rates. Of this amount, £9,394 was subsequently remitted, and may therefore be regarded as a free grant (see Table I., col 9, line 4); and £638,168 as a loan (see Table II., col. 11, line 5)

Under the Relief of Distress Amendment Act, 1880, £198,346 was lent out of Imperial funds at ordinary rates of interest, the repayment being guaranteed by the baronies concerned. Of the sum mentioned, £63,346 was devoted to railway works (see Table IV., col. 5 line 1); and £135,000 to harbour works (see Table IV., col. 5, line 2).

Expenditure, 1882–3

Under the Arrears of Rent Act, 1882, a loan of £27,010 2*s* 11*d* was made out of the Irish Church Fund at the ordinary rate of interest (see Table VI., col. 2, line 2), and was devoted towards the cancellation of arrears of rent on certain holdings, and the repayment was charged on these holdings. Of this sum £14,175 14*s* 3*d* had been repaid on 31st March, 1905, £418 10*s* 11*d* had been written off, and the amount outstanding was £12,415 17*s* 9*d*. A free grant was also made from the same fund of £780,492 15*s* 6*d* for the cancellation of arrears of rent and rent-charges on certain holdings (see Table VI., col. 3, line 2); and under the same Act as amended by the Public Tramways Act, 1883, a free grant of £133,173 10*s*. 2*d* was made out of the Irish Church Fund towards assisting emigration (see Table I., col. 10, line 13, and Table VI., col. 3, line 3). Under the emigration clauses of the Arrears of Rent Act, £11,755 was lent out of Imperial Funds at ordinary rates of interest to Boards of Guardians and was charged on local rates for the purpose of assisting emigration (see Table V., col. 11 line 3)

Under the Relief of Distressed Unions (Ireland) Act, 1883, £10,257 15*s* 0*d* was given out of the Irish Church Fund as a free grant to five unions, to enable the Guardians to meet their liabilities (See Table I., col. 10, line 9, and Table VI., col 3, line 4).

Expenditure, 1885–6.

Under the Poor Relief Act of 1886 £20,000 was given as a free grant out of the Irish Church Funds to the Guardians of Belmullet, Clifden, Galway, Oughterard, Swinford, and Westport Unions, to aid in defraying cost of relief (see Table I., col. 10, line 10, and Table VI., col. 3, line 5); and another £20,000 was similarly given under the same Act for piers and roads (see Table I., col. 4, line 11, and Table VI., col. 3, line 6), and £913 was supplied by voluntary charitable funds for the same purposes (see Table I., col. 7, line 11).

Expenditure, 1890–91.

The following is a statement of the expenditure upon the relief of distress in 1890-91 —

	£	s.	d.
Wages to labourers,	128,496	0	0
Foods and materials,	12,745	0	0
Royal Engineer officers and Royal Marines,	3,049	0	0
Royal Engineer Supervisors and members of the Royal Irish Constabulary,	23,133	0	0
County Surveyors and assistants,	4,999	0	0
Local Government Board Inspectors and Relieving Officers,	4,266	0	0
Extra remuneration (civil departments),	1,397	0	0
Hire of steamers,	7,088	0	0
Extra cost (railways),	35,798	0	0
Miscellaneous expenses,	3,351	15	0
Chargeable to distress,	224,322	15	0
Seed Inspectors,	4,000	0	0
Completion works contract,	8,000	0	0
Forestry operations,	2,508	0	0
Chargeable to other services,	14,508	0	0
Total,	238,830	15	0

Particulars of the expenditure upon the relief works undertaken during this period will be found in Returns presented to Parliament on the 6th March, 1891, and the 25th February, 1892, Nos. 132 and 85 respectively.

Under the Seed Supply Act of 1890, £273,620 was advanced by way of loan out of Imperial funds. The repayment of £766 was subsequently remitted, and this sum may consequently be regarded as a free grant (see Table I., col 9, line 5); and the balance, £272,854, as a loan (see Table III., col. 11, line 1). All charges by way of discounts on cash sales (see Table I., col. 10, line 5), and all interest, was borne by the Irish Church Fund, the total amount so chargeable being £17,563 19*s*. 6*d*., which may therefore be regarded as an additional free grant. (See Table VI., col. 3, line 7). It should be noted that the repayment of all money advanced for the supply of seed under this Act, as under the Seed Supply Act of 1880, and the similar Acts of 1895 and 1900, was charged in the local rates, but the bulk was recovered from the persons to whom the seed was supplied.

Expenditure, 1894–5.

The relief of distress expenditure in 1894-5 was as follows —

	£	s.	d.
Wages to labourers,	47,550	11	1
Tools and materials,	4,373	2	9
Royal Engineer officers and Royal Marines,	1,462	2	6
Royal Engineer Supervisors and members of the Royal Irish Constabulary,	8,713	13	2
County Surveyors and Assistants,	1,596	8	8
Local Government Board Inspectors and Relieving Officers,	3,000	0	0
Extra remuneration (civil departments),	842	0	0
Hire of steamers,			
Extra cost (railways),			
Miscellaneous expenses,	800	14	5
Chargeable to distress,	68,338	12	7
Seed Inspectors,	3,873	6	7
Completion works contract,	6,262	15	0
Spraying machines,	650	0	0
Extra cost (railways),	900	0	0
Forestry operations,			
Chargeable to other services,	11,686	1	7
Total,	80,024	14	2

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Some particulars of the expenditure upon relief works during this period will be found in a Return presented to Parliament on the 31st May, 1895, No. 287.

Under the Seed Supply Act of 1895, £62,034 was advanced from Imperial funds (see Table III, col. 11, line 2). The payments for cash discounts (see Table I, col. 10, line 6), and interest were charged against the Irish Church Fund, and these payments amounted in all to £3,738, which may be regarded as a free grant (See Table VI., col. 3, line 3).

Expenditure, 1897-98.

The expenditure out of Imperial funds (voted money) upon relief works during the winter of 1897, and the spring and summer of 1898, was 75 per cent. of such expenditure of Boards of Guardians in this behalf as was approved by the Local Government Board and amounted to £22,182 18s. All this money was spent upon works of utility such as road-making, and may therefore be classed as reproductive.

Additional Government Grants amounting to £3,994 were given for the purpose of reducing the rates in certain distressed Electoral Divisions where the cost of the exceptional relief pressed heavily, and a sum of £3,038 was given to Belmullet Union in respect of the year 1897.

Free grants of seed were also made which cost £3,867 15s., and the whole of the produce of this seed was subsequently sprayed under the supervision of the Agricultural Department of the Land Commission at the Government expense, a sum of £1,909 17s. 6d being mainly accounted for in this way.

The following additional expenditure was incurred by the Government during this period of distress:—

	£	s.	d.
Extra remuneration and expenses of Relieving Officers, - -	1,125	4	11
Extra remuneration and expenses of County Surveyors, - -	644	15	0
Salaries and expenses of inspectors, &c, - - - -	7,070	7	7
	£8,840	7	6

Under the Seed Supply Act, 1898, £77,763 was advanced out of the Imperial funds as before (see Table III, col. 11, line 3), the charges for cash discount (see Table I, col. 10, line 7) and interest being borne by the Irish Church Fund, this amounting in all to £4,769 18s. 8d., which may therefore be regarded as a free grant (see Table VI., col. 3, line 9).

Expenditure, 1904-5.

In 1904-5 the Boards of Guardians of seven Unions expended £17,191 10s. 8d. upon relief works in their Unions in pursuance of Section 13 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, of which £12,241 1s. 3d. was recouped by the Government from Imperial funds, and the remainder was defrayed from local rates.

This money was expended on works of public utility such as the repair and construction of roads, which could be carried out mainly by unskilled labour, and may, therefore, be classed as reproductive. A further sum of £2,394 8s. 10d. from Imperial funds was expended in connection with the employment of engineers, the work of supervision, and the completion of some of the relief works. This expenditure might also be classed as reproductive.

Under the Seed Supply Act of 1905 loans were made from Imperial funds amounting to £70,018 (see Table V., col. 11, line 1), and a free grant of £9,500 was made by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction towards decreasing the actual cost to purchasers of seed potatoes under the scheme issued by the Local Government Board. A sum of £209 19s. 1d. was also expended on the remuneration of four official inspectors lent by the Department to assist the Poor Law Guardians in the selection of the seed. These sums were paid out of the Department's Endowment Fund, nearly one-half of which is derived from the Irish Church Fund, the remainder coming from Imperial sources. The remuneration of the inspectors employed by the Local Government Board to inspect the seed amounted to £1,949 19s. 2d.

Summarisation of Expenditure.

The difficulties in the way of accurately summarising the expenditure incurred in connection with the relief of distress during the period 1880 to 1905 will be obvious from the foregoing remarks; but the following is thought to be as fair a summarisation as can be attempted, and if any exception is taken to the inclusion of certain items, the detailed information given above will enable anyone so objecting to correct the following table according to the view taken.

APPENDIX IV.

TABLE showing AMOUNTS of FREE GRANTS and LOANS made in connection with the RELIEF of DISTRESS in IRELAND from 1880 to 1905, distinguishing IRISH from IMPERIAL SOURCES.

PERIOD	FREE GRANTS		LOANS	
	From Irish Funds.	From Imperial Funds	From Irish Funds	From Imperial Funds
	£	£	£	£
1880-2, ...	41,067	57 596	1 228,367	241,414
1882 3 . .	923 923	–	27 010	11,755
1885-6, ...	40,000	—	—	—
1890-1, ...	17 564	239 597	—	272,854
1894 5, ...	3,738	80,025	—	62,034
1897-8, ...	4,769	43 833	—	77,763
1904-5, ...	9,500	18,585	—	70,018
Total, ...	1 040 561	437 636	1,255,377	1 335,838
	£1,478,197		£2,591,715	
	£4,069,912			

The difficulties of drawing a line of demarcation between relief of distress purposes, properly so called, and reproductive works are, as already mentioned, very great, but undoubtedly nearly all the free grants and half the loans were applied in Relief of Distress.

It will be understood that the above figures understate the case, as it has been found possible to estimate the cost of administration only in a few cases, and where the interest on loans issued free or at less than the ordinary rate of interest was defrayed out of Imperial funds, particulars are not available of the additional amount thus expended, though where the interest was borne by the Irish Church Fund, the amount so paid is included in the figures shown above.

Local Rates.

It must be observed that no account has been taken in the above table of the amount of money that has been applied out of local rates, during the period under discussion, towards the relief of exceptional distress, as the materials for making anything like an accurate calculation are not available; but the poor relief expenditure during the years of distress is estimated by the Local Government Board to have exceeded the average expenditure of normal years by about £500,000.

Charitable Funds.

It should also be noted that a large sum was spent out of charitable funds. Naturally, complete information is not available about this, but the following are the chief items:—

In the winter of 1879-80 large sums were collected by the Duchess of Marlborough's Committee and by the Mansion House Committee. The former expended in relief and in the supply of seed, £130,677. The latter spent similarly a total of about £174,125. A sum of £20,000 odd or £21,000 odd was also voted by the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, and was expended mainly in piers and harbours. Considerable sums were also expended in relief, from other charitable funds, such as the Land League Relief Fund, The New York Herald Fund, and the Philadelphia Fund, particulars of which are not readily obtainable. In 1885-6 seed potatoes were distributed by Mr. Tuke and other charitable persons, but no exact information is available as to the expenditure incurred. In 1898 the Mansion House Committee collected a sum of £11,155 2s. 10d., which was expended in the form of grants to schools, foods, employment, supply of seed, expenses of mangement, &c.

In 1906 a grant of £300 was received from the Discretionary Committee of the Queen's Unemployed Fund, and was expended upon Relief Works in congested divisions of Westport and Clifden Unions.

Light Railways, &c.

If account is taken of the money spent on light railways and other undoubtedly reproductive purposes (details of which are given in the statements following Table VIII.), the expenditure already mentioned must be increased by over £3,000,000.

WALTER CALLAN
Secretary.

12th August, 1907.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V.

STATEMENT of MONEY SPENT in RELIEF of DISTRESS since 1878, through the Commissioners of Public

TABLE I.—GOVERNMENT FREE GRANTS AND REMISSIONS

Purpose.	Act.	Reproductive Works which also gave Employment during the Period of Distress.					
		Charged on Imperial Funds.	Charged on Irish Church Fund.	Charged on Local Rates	Charged on Lands. (Private Property.)	Supplied by Voluntary Charitable Funds.	Total.
1	2	3	4	5	6.	7.	8.
		£	£	£	£	£	£
Improvement of Lands,	43 Vic. c 4, and 43 & 44 Vic., c. 14.		21,275 (remission)				21,275
Baronial Works (Roads, &c.),	do.		7 (remission)				7
Arterial Drainage,	do.		716 (remission)				716
Seed Supply, 1880,	43 Vic., c 1,						
Do., 1890,	54 Vic., c. 1,						
Do., 1895,	58 Vic., c. 2,						
Do., 1898	61 & 62 Vic., c. 50,						
Relief of Distress (Food and Fuel)	43 Vic., c. 4,						
Relief of Distressed Unions,	46 & 47 Vic., c 24,						
Poor Relief Act, 1886,	49 Vic., c. 17,						
Piers and Roads Commission,	do.,		20 000			913	20 913
Fishery Piers,	43 & 44 Vic., c 14,	48,202				16,015	64,217
Emigration,	45 & 46 Vic., c 47, sec. 20, &c.						
		48,202	41,998			16 928	107,128

TABLE II.—LOANS AT EXCEPTIONAL

Improvement of Lands,	43 Vic., c. 4, and 43 & 44 Vic., c. 14				902,345		902,345
Baronial Works,	do.			271,182			271,182
Public Health,	do.			38 536			38,536
Arterial Drainage,	do.				5,420		5,420
Seed Supply, 1880,	43 Vic., c. 1,						
Relief of Distress (Food and Fuel).	43 Vic., c 4,						
				309,718	907,765		1,217,483

TABLE III.—LOANS (at the ordinary rates of interest), THE INTEREST

Seed Supply, 1890,	54 Vic., c 1,						
Do., 1895,	58 Vic., c. 2,						
Do., 1898,	61 & 62 Vic., c. 50,						

TABLE IV.—LOANS (at ordinary rates) THE REPAYMENT OF WHICH IS GUARANTEED

Railways,	43 and 44 Vic., c. 14, sec. 13.			63,346			63,346
Harbours,	do.,			135,000			135 000
				198,346			198,346

TABLE V.—LOANS AT ORDINARY

Seed Supply, 1905,	6 Ed. VII., c 3,						
Relief of Distress (Food and Fuel)	43 Vic., c. 4,						
Emigration,	45 & 46 Vic., c. 47, sec. 20, &c						
Grand Totals,		48,202	41,998	508,064	907,765	16,928	1,522,957

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

medium of the COMMISSIONERS of PUBLIC WORKS, IRELAND. (Supplied by Works, Ireland.)

OF LOANS AND PRIVATE VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.

MEASURES OF TEMPORARY ALLEVIATION.					Grand Total.
Charged on Imperial Funds	Charged on Irish Church Fund	Charged on Local Rates.	Supplied by Voluntary Charitable Funds.	Total.	
9	10	11	12	13	14.
£	£	£	£	£	£
					21,275
					7
					716
9,394 (remission)				9,394	9,394
765 (remission)	901			1,667	1,667
	239			239	239
	889			889	889
	19,069			19,069	19,069
	10,258			10,258	10,258
	20,000			20,000	20,000
					20,913
					64,217
	133,173			133,173	133,173
10,160	184,529			194,689	301,817

RATES, OR FREE OF INTEREST.

					902,346
					271 132
					33 536
					5 420
		638,168		638,168	638,168
		11 384		11 384	11 384
		649,552		649,552	1,857,035

ON WHICH WAS MET OUT OF THE CHURCH FUND.'

		272,854		272,854	272,854
		62,034		62,034	62,034
		77,763		77,763	77,763
		412,651		412 651	412,651

BY BARONIES UNDER THE RELIEF OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT ACT, 1880.

					63,346
					135 000
					198,346

RATES OF INTEREST.

		70,018		70,018	70,018
		4,900		4,900	4,900
		11,755		11,755	11,755
		86,673		86,673	86,673
10,160	184,529	1,148,876		1,343,565	2,866,522

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV

TABLE VI.

AMOUNT of MONEY EXPENDED in RELIEF of DISTRESS in IRELAND since the year 1878, from the CHURCH TEMPORALITIES FUND. (Supplied by Irish Land Commission.)

Act 1.	On Loan. 2.	Free Grants. 3.	Total. 4.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Relief of Distress (Ireland) Acts, 1880,	1,250,863 12 7	19,069 3 0	1,269 932 15 7
Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, 1882 (Cancellation of Arrears).	27,010 2 11	780,492 15 6	940,675 8 7
Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, 1882 (Emigration),	—	133,172 10 2	
Relief of Distressed Unions (Ireland) Act, 1883,	—	10,257 15 0	10,257 15 0
Poor Relief (Ireland) Act, 1886, for Relief,	—	20,000 0 0	40 000 0 0
Poor Relief (Ireland) Act, 1886; Piers and Roads Commission	—	20 000 0 0	
Seed Potatoes Supply Act, 1890,	—	17,563 19 6	17,563 19 6
Seed Potatoes Supply Act, 1895,	—	3,738 3 3	3,738 3 3
Seed Potatoes Supply Act, 1898,	—	4,769 18 8	4,769 18 8
Totals,	1,277,873 15 6	1,009,064 5 1	2,286,938 0 7

TABLE VII.

SHOWING CERTAIN MONEY EXPENDED in RELIEF of DISTRESS in IRELAND in 1897–8. (Supplied by the Local Government Board).

UNIONS.	No. of Electoral Divisions in which relief works were opened		Amount recouped by Government, *i.e.* 75 per cent. of approved expenditure upon relief works.	Additional Grants in aid of Rates.	Free Grants of Seed	Total of Government Grants.
	Congested.	Non-Congested.				
			£ s. d.	£	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Ballinrobe,	4	—	747 19 6	—	194 14 4	942 13 10
Bawnboy,	1	2	255 7 11	—	—	255 7 11
Belmullet,	All	—	4,626 15 11	1,675	624 12 9	6,926 8 8
Cahercivoen,	1	—	41 9 9	—	—	41 9 9
Clifden,	14	—	2,379 11 3	500	389 15 7	3,269 6 10
Dunfanaghy,	1	—	50 4 6	—	—	50 4 6
Galway,	3	—	708 5 9	—	102 11 7	810 17 4
Killala,	2	2	1,302 7 4	—	203 10 0	1 505 17 4
Oughterard,	10	—	4,024 4 9	500	651 5 6	5,175 10 3
Swinford,	19	2	5 177 16 9	1,319	1,109 13 5	7,606 10 2
Westport,	9	—	2,868 14 7	—	591 11 10	3,460 6 5
Totals,	—	—	22,182 18 0	3,994	3,367 15 0	30,044 13 0

TABLE VIII.

SHOWING CERTAIN MONEY EXPENDED in RELIEF of DISTRESS in IRELAND in 1904–5. (Supplied by the Local Government Board).

UNION.	No. of Electoral Divisions in which relief works were opened.		Expenditure by Guardians	Amount recouped by Government	Proportion of approved Expenditure recouped by Government	Expenditure defrayed from local rates.
	Congested.	Non Congested.				
			£ s. d.	£ s. d.	Per Cent	£ s. d.
Bawnboy,	—	6	870 9 10	402 14 11	50	467 14 11
Belmullet,	All	—	4,046 6 10	3,025 18 3	75	1,020 8 7
Clifden,	10	—	1,218 2 6	871 7 2	75	340 15 4
Galway,	3	—	336 5 0	166 17 8	50	169 7 6
Oughterard,	11	—	2,688 14 2	2,005 3 4	75	683 10 10
Swinford,	16	2	5,045 8 6	3,703 1 3	75	1,342 7 3
Westport,	6	—	2 986 3 10	2 065 18 10	75	920 5 0

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

THE following STATEMENT (supplied by the Commissioners of Public Works) shows the MONEYS SPENT or ALLOCATED out of IMPERIAL and IRISH FUNDS for LIGHT RAILWAYS or cognate works.

IMPERIAL FUNDS.

TRAMWAYS AND PUBLIC COMPANIES' ACTS, 1883.

Dividend on guaranteed Capital of certain Railways maximum of 2 per cent per annum on £1,536,112 = £30,722.

Capitalized Value, ... £1,024,066

£30,722 is the maximum annual sum payable. The amount that has been actually paid is shown below (see A).

RAILWAYS ACTS, 1889 AND 1893.

Free Grants, ... £1,147,867

Details are given below (see C).

RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Free Grants for Railways, Details are given below (see C) . . . £412,175

Free Grants for Coach and Steamer Services, ... 83,332

MARINE WORKS ACT, 1902.

Free Grants for Fishery Piers, &c., . . £100,000

IRISH CHURCH FUND.

Sea Fisheries Act, 1883.

Free Grants for Fishery Piers, . . £250,000

£3,017,440

Of these sums the Grants for Railways under the Act of 1896 were expressly confined to Railways lying wholly or mainly in congested districts, and the Grants under the Act of 1902 were confined to congested districts, with one exception, amounting to some £6,000 The actual expenditure up to date under the Act of 1902 is about £31,000.

Sums of money were also spent in supplying boats and gear to fishermen out of the Irish Reproductive Loan and Sea and Coast Fisheries Funds which, for some years, were administered by the Board of Public Works; these funds are now in the hands of the Congested Districts Board and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction

Under the Act of 1883 the guaranteeing areas are liable for the payment of dividends, and also of any deficit on working expenses of the guaranteed lines The Treasury recoupment is confined to one-half of the sums paid in respect of dividends only, with a maximum of two per cent on the paid-up capital. The following statements show the total amount so far contributed by the Treasury to 31st December, 1906, and also the total net payments so made out of rates, after deducting the Treasury contributions.

A.—STATEMENT showing total amount contributed to 31st December, 1906, by the Treasury to Railways with Guarantees under the Tramways and Public Companies Act, 1883.

Name of Railway	Amount of Treasury Contribution	Amount recouped to Treasury (Surplus Receipts).
	£	£
Clogher Valley, ...	46,372	—
Cavan and Leitrim, ...	67,588	—
West Clare, ...	50,587	—
Mitchelstowe and Fermoy, ...	10,991*	—
Schull and Skibbereen, ...	20,612	—
West Donegal, ...	2,326†	—
Cork and Muskerry, ...	18,557	—
Dublin and Blessington, ...	10,289	—
Ballinascarthy and Timoleague, ...	10,090	—
Loughrea and Attymon, ...	14,698	—
Tralee and Dingle, ...	17,665†‡	—
Ballinrobe and Claremorris, ...	16,607	—
South Clare, ...	30,658	—
Tuam and Claremorris, ...	11,254	—
Donoughmore Extension, ...	7,242	—
Donegal and Killybegs, ...	159§	386
Headford and Kenmare, ...	15,189	—
Killorglin and Valentia, ...	17,690	—
Collooney and Swineford, ...	6,243	41
Claremorris and Swineford, ...	3,839	—
Stranorlar and Glenties, ...	4§	2,299
	377,660	2,726

Net Treasury Contribution, £374,934.

* Treasury liability redeemed 1909.
† Treasury liability redeemed, 1898
‡ In addition £2,500 was paid out of Parliamentary Grants in the year 1894–5 to the guaranteeing area in relief of the charges thrown on it in consequence of the Camp accident
§ Treasury and local liability cancelled by Great Northern (Ireland) and Mid and Railways Act, 1906, and Treasury's right to share in future surplus receipts surrendered on receipt of £5,000

B.—STATEMENT showing net amounts paid by each County or other Guaranteeing Area after deducting amount of Treasury Contributions towards Guaranteed Dividends as shown in Statement A, but without making allowance for the sums recouped to the Counties out of the Local Taxation Account.*

Railway.	Guaranteeing Area.	Amount.
		£
Clogher Valley, ...	Co Tyrone. ...	64,257
Do, ...	„ Fermanagh, ..	12,851
Cavan and Leitrim, ...	„ Cavan, ...	19,709
Do, ...	„ Leitrim, ...	85,499
West Clare, ...	„ Clare, ...	68,438
Mitchelstown and Fermoy, ...	„ Cork, ...	16,055†
Skull and Skibbereen, ...	„ Cork, ...	57,298
West Donegal, ...	„ Donegal, ...	2,563†
Cork and Muskerry, ...	„ Cork, ...	20,326
Dublin and Blessington	„ Dublin ...	6,800
Do., ...	„ Wicklow, ...	6,800
Ballinascarthy and Timoleague, ...	„ Cork, ...	37,509
Loughrea and Attymon.	„ Galway, ...	13,706
Tralee and Dingle, ...	„ Kerry, ...	56,700†
Do, ...	Tralee Urban District Co.	2,967†
Ballinrobe and Claremorris, ...	Co Mayo, ...	16,653
South Clare.	„ Clare, ..	50,442
Tuam and Claremorris.	„ Mayo, ...	6,635
Donoughmore Extension, ...	„ Cork, ...	11,922
Donegal and Killybegs, ...	„ Donegal, ...	3,096†
Headford and Kenmare, ...	„ Kerry, ...	13,152
Killorglin and Valentia, ...	„ Kerry, ...	22,353
Collooney and Swineford, ..	„ Sligo, ...	4,996
Claremorris and Swineford, ...	„ Mayo, ...	3,839
Stranorlar and Glenties, ...	„ Donegal, ...	—
		609,570

† To date of cessation of Treasury liability—See Statement A.

C.—STATEMENT showing Light Railways in Ireland constructed by the aid of Government Moneys.

	RAILWAY.	Government Grant.
		£
Railways Acts, 1889 and 1893.	Ballina and Killala, . .	44,000
	Bantry Extension, . .	14,940
	Claremorris and Swineford, } Collooney and Swineford, }	146,042
	Downpatrick and Ardglass .	29,980
	Galway and Clifden, . .	264,600
	Headford and Kenmare, .	49,984
	Killorglin and Valentia, . .	85,000
	Westport and Mallaranny, .	131,400
	Preliminary Expenses, . .	7,321
	Achill Extension, . .	72,578
	Baltimore and Skibbereen, .	56,700
	Donegal and Killybegs, . .	121,436
	Stranorlar and Glenties, .	123,856
Railways Act, 1896	Buncrana and Carndonagh, .	9,8527
	Letterkenny and Burtonport, .	313,642
		£1,560,042

* By the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, sec. 53, Cl. 4—When the amount required to meet any railway or harbour charge connected with any guarantee given before the passing of the Act or to meet two or more such charges when added together exceeds a sum equal to 6d. in the pound on the rateable value of the area concerned, a sum equal to one-half of such excess is repayable out of the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

D.—RETURN showing the population in each county in Ireland in 1891 and 1901, the decrease in under 20 years of age, between 20 and 65, and over 65; the total number of marriages, births, excess of births over deaths during the period, and the annual average rate per 1,000 inhabitants; inhabitants.

County.	Population 1891. (1.)	Population 1901. (2.)	Decrease in the Population from 1891–1901. (3.)	Percentage of decrease of Population. (4.)	Percentage of Population in 1901. Under 20 years. (5.)	Over 20 years and not exceeding 65 years. (6.)	Over 65 years (7.)	Marriages. Number of Marriages during ten years 1891–1901. (8.)	Annual Rate per 1,000. (9.)
Donegal, ...	185,635	176,722	11,913	6·4	41·0	51·4	7·6	7,393	4·1
Sligo, ...	94,416	84,083	10,333	10·9	42·5	50·6	6·9	3,236	3·6
Leitrim, ...	78,618	69,343	9,275	11·8	43·3	49·3	7·4	2,799	3·8
Mayo, ...	216,698	199,166	16,532	8·9	46·3	46·9	6·8	7,167	3·4
Roscommon, ..	116,552	101,791	14,761	12·7	43·0	49·2	7·8	3,976	3·6
Galway, ..	211,227	192,549	16,678	8·8	44·6	46·0	7·1	6,722	3·3
Kerry, ...	179,136	165,726	13,410	7·5	45·8	47·5	6·7	6,797	4·0
Clare, .. .	126,244	112,334	13,910	11·0	45·0	49·6	5·4	4,039	3·4
Total, ..	1,210,526	1,098,714	111,812	9·2	43·9	48·9	7·2	42,131	3·6
OTHER COUNTIES:									
Cork, ...	438,432	404,611	33,821	7·7	41·5	52·3	6·2	16,525	4·4
Limerick, ..	158,912	146,098	12,614	8·1	40·5	53·2	6·3	7,193	4·7
Tipperary, ..	175,217	160,262	14,955	8·6	39·2	54·2	6·6	7,098	4·2
Waterford, ..	95,702	87,187	8,515	8·9	39·6	53·7	6·7	3,995	4·4
Longford, ..	52,647	46,672	5,975	11·4	39·7	52·3	8·0	1,984	4·0
Westmeath, ..	68,611	61,629	6,982	10·2	38·4	54·6	7·0	2,663	4·1
Meath, ...	76,111	67,497	8,614	11·3	37·6	55·5	6·9	2,922	4·1
Louth, ...	71,914	65,820	6,094	8·5	40·1	54·0	5·9	2,768	4·0
Dublin, ...	146,210	157,568	9,358 (Increase).	6·3	38·3	56·8	4·9	8,516	4·7
City of Dublin, ..	268,650	290,638	21,988 (Increase).	8·2	39·5	57·0	6·5	21,572	8·5
Kildare, ...	70,206	63,566	6,640	9·4	39·6	54·6	5·6	6,081	4·6
King's Co., ..	65,563	60,187	5,376	8·2	40·1	53·2	6·7	2,576	4·1
Queen's Co., ..	63,855	57,417	6,438	10·1	37·4	54·6	7·8	2,230	3·7
Wicklow, ...	64,492	60,824	3,668	5·7	39·6	53·4	7·0	3,148	5·0
Wexford, ...	112,063	104,104	7,959	7·1	37·3	55·7	7·0	4,958	4·6
Carlow, ...	41,964	37,748	4,216	10·0	38·5	54·5	7·0	1,712	4·3
Kilkenny, ..	87,496	79,159	8,337	9·5	38·5	54·6	6·9	3,517	4·2
Londonderry, ..	152,009	144,404	7,605	5·0	39·9	53·3	6·8	7,849	5·6
Antrim, ...	206,010	196,090	11,920	5·7	41·4	51·2	7·4	10,661	5·6
City of Belfast, ..	278,184	349,180	75,996 (Increase).	27·8	43·1	54·1	2·6	26,981	8·2
Tyrone, ...	171,401	150,567	20,834	12·2	37·7	54·6	7·7	7,207	4·5
Down, ...	219,405	205,889	13,516	6·2	39·9	52·6	7·5	10,780	5·3
Armagh, ...	137,877	125,392	12,485	9·1	40·5	52·3	7·2	7,045	5·4
Monaghan, .	86,206	74,611	11,595	13·5	37·5	54·5	8·0	3,581	4·5
Fermanagh, .	74,170	65,430	8,740	11·8	37·9	54·2	7·9	2,905	4·2
Cavan, . ..	111,917	97,541	14,376	12·6	40·0	52·7	7·3	3,994	3·8
Total of these Non-Congested Counties.	3,494,224	3,360,061	134,163 (net decrease)	4·0	40·1	53·8	6·1	179,451	5·2

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

the population during these two dates, and the rate of decrease, the percentage of the population and deaths during the ten years 1891–1901, and the annual average rate per 1,000 inhabitants; the the number of emigrants during the ten years, and the average annual rate of emigration per 1,000

Births		Deaths		Excess of Births over Deaths		Emigration		
Number of Births during ten years 1891–1901 (10)	Annual Rate per 1,000 (11)	Number of Deaths during ten years 1891–1901 (12)	Annual Rate per 1,000 (13)	Amount of Excess during ten years 1891–1901 (14)	Excess per 1,000 (annually) (15)	Number of Emigrants from 1st April, 1891, to 31st March, 1901. (16)	Average Annual Rate per 1,000 (17)	COUNTY.
37,916	21 1	27,010	15 0	10,906	6 1	12,977	7-2	Donegal.
18,074	20 3	13,002	14 6	5,072	5 7	14,065	15 8	Sligo.
15,117	20 4	10,608	14-3	4,509	6 1	9,830	13 3	Leitrim
47,216	22-6	29,095	13 9	18,121	8-7	40,703	19 5	Mayo
21,195	16 4	15,452	14-2	5,743	5 3	16,332	14 9	Roscommon
44,912	22-2	30,776	15 2	14,133	7 0	36,820	18 2	Galway.
40,596	23 5	24,463	14-2	16,136	9 4	38,590	22 4	Kerry
24,716	20 7	18,547	15 5	6,169	5-2	18,031	15-1	Clare.
249,745	21 8	168,956	14 6	80,789	7 0	187,357	16 2	Total
								OTHER COUNTIES.
93,926	22 3	75,054	17 8	18,872	4 5	77,072	18 3	Cork.
34,510	22 6	27,482	18 0	7,028	4 6	14,426	9-5	Limerick.
35,025	20-9	29,024	17 3	6,001	3 6	19,050	11 4	Tipperary.
20,099	22-0	17,893	19 6	2,206	2-4	10,058	11 0	Waterford.
9,696	19-5	8,114	16-3	1,582	3-2	5,071	10 3	Longford.
13,201	20 3	11,336	17-4	1,865	2 9	3,354	5 2	Westmeath
13,732	19 1	12,448	17 3	1,284	1 8	4,258	6-1	Meath
14,603	21 2	12,411	18 0	2,192	3 2	2,803	4 1	Louth.
36 727	20 4	32,469	18 0	4,258	2 8	10,615	2 5	Dublin
80,634	31 9	75,442	29 9	5,192	1 9			City of Dublin.
14,438	21 6	11,590	17 3	2,848	4 3	2,113	3 2	Kildare
12,876	20-5	10,595	16 9	2,281	3 6	3,708	5 9	King's Co.
11,901	16 6	10,486	17 3	1,415	2-3	4,434	7 3	Queen's Co.
13,160	21 0	10,726	17 1	2,434	3-9	1,691	2 7	Wicklow
22,454	20 8	20,671	19-1	1,783	1 6	3,960	3 7	Wexford.
8,325	20 9	7,617	19 1	708	1 8	2,610	6-5	Carlow.
17,325	20 8	15,494	18 6	1,831	2-2	4,835	5-8	Kilkenny.
34,168	23 1	27,205	18 4	6,963	4 7	8,152	5-5	Londonderry.
47,569	24-8	34,830	18 2	12,739	6 3	14,946	2-9	Antrim
108,797	33 0	77,543	23-6	31,254	10 0			City of Belfast
32,321	20-1	28,790	17 0	3,531	2-2	12,598	7 8	Tyrone
47 839	23 3	40,017	19-5	7,822	3-7	7,837	3 7	Down
30,548	23 2	26,068	19-8	4 480	3 4	7,208	5 5	Armagh
15 227	18 9	14 721	18 3	506	0 6	5,301	6 6	Monaghan.
13,553	19 4	11,708	16 8	1 845	2 6	5,403	7 7	Fermanagh
20,330	19 4	15,862	15 1	4,468	4 3	12,030	11 5	Cavan.
802,084	23 4	665,596	19 4	137,388	4-0	243,636	7 1	Total of these Non Congested Counties.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

E.—STATISTICS OF THE NUMBER, VALUATION, ACREAGE, AND POPULATION OF HOLDINGS IN CONGESTED DISTRICTS

(I.)—TABLE showing Total Number of Holdings and Number of each of Eleven Classes of Holdings, arranged according to Valuation, in the Congested Districts

County	Total Number of Holdings	Classification of Holdings, and Number in each Class										
		Not exceeding £4	Above £4 and not exceeding £10	Above £10 and not exceeding £15	Above £15 and not exceeding £20	Above £20 and not exceeding £30	Above £30 and not exceeding £40	Above £40 and not exceeding £50	Above £50 and not exceeding £100	Above £100 and not exceeding £200	Above £200 and not exceeding £300	Above £300 in value
Clare,	51	26	14	7	1	2	—	—	—	—	1	—
Cork,	4,709	1,376	2,044	654	289	203	68	29	33	12	1	—
Donegal,	19,606	12,855	5,294	762	282	226	90	29	38	22	5	3
Galway,	11,338	7,150	3,287	392	140	137	61	40	91	31	6	2
Kerry,	10,053	3,769	3,610	1,336	584	450	166	61	58	14	4	1
Leitrim,	6,402	2,042	3,292	653	195	122	46	21	23	5	3	—
Mayo,	22,102	13,239	7,078	938	306	234	88	46	112	46	10	9
Roscommon,	5,800	2,787	2,465	366	107	74	32	13	29	11	3	3
Sligo,	4,803	1,864	2,161	360	146	87	45	17	32	20	2	—
Total,	84,954	45,158	29,275	5,476	2,050	1,535	596	256	416	161	35	14

(II.)—TABLE showing Total Area and Area of each of Eleven Classes of Holdings, arranged according to Valuation, in Congested Districts.

County	Total Acreage occupied by Agricultural Holdings.	Classification of Holdings according to Rateable Valuation with the Area under each Class										
		Not exceeding £4.	Above £4 and not exceeding £10	Above £10 and not exceeding £15.	Above £15 and not exceeding £20	Above £20 and not exceeding £30	Above £30 and not exceeding £40	Above £40 and not exceeding £50	Above £50 and not exceeding £100	Above £100 and not exceeding £200	Above £200 and not exceeding £300	Above £300 in value
	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
Clare,	3,989	495	577	486	82	218	—	—	—	—	2,131	—
Cork,	206,797	24,880	76,084	41,176	23,282	21,123	7,500	4,107	5,939	2,506	200	—
Donegal	671,926	307,124	212,484	51,344	23,138	26,039	9,060	4,109	10,378	15,890	5,875	6,485
Galway,	464,356	136,848	123,237	30,843	15,072	37,424	25,712	11,640	43,548	27,267	4,530	2,369
Kerry,	576,889	69,170	214,244	119,733	67 524	57,985	23,431	8,484	10,973	4,581	2,313	1,451
Leitrim,	143,339	25,112	67,562	23,105	9,573	8,234	4,443	1,934	2,987	1,004	1,380	—
Mayo,	690,413	160,162	226,765	51,417	33,839	44,603	26,699	12,713	46 836	17,609	6,157	28 613
Roscommon,	109,364	30,087	45,108	11,364	4,343	4,371	2,718	1,220	4,134	2,469	1,107	2 443
Sligo,	116,605	16,573	43,627	11,851	8,062	10,166	5,414	1,928	6,853	7,314	1,487	—
Total,	2 986,681	801,451	1 014,988	341,319	184,945	215,163	104,677	46,441	131,648	78,645	25 240	41 364

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

(III.)—TABLE showing Total Valuation and Valuation of each of Eleven Classes of Holdings, arranged according to Valuation, in the Congested Districts.

COUNTY	Total Valuation	CLASSIFICATION OF HOLDINGS AND TOTAL RATEABLE VALUATION OF THOSE IN EACH CLASS.										
		Not exceeding £4	Above £4 and not exceeding £10	Above £10 and not exceeding £15	Above £15 and not exceeding £20	Above £20 and not exceeding £30	Above £30 and not exceeding £40	Above £40 and not exceeding £50	Above £50 and not exceeding £100	Above £100 and not exceeding £200	Above £200 and not exceeding £300	Above £300 in value
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Clare	583	54	84	83	16	56	—	—	—	—	285	—
Cork,	42,549	3,380	13,753	8,078	5,005	4,946	2,397	1,291	2,158	1,608	218	—
Donegal,	82,107	27,516	32,228	9,378	4,904	5,421	3,026	1,302	2 668	2,931	1,333	1 400
Galway	82 915	15,587	19,937	4,780	2,407	3,393	2,123	1,824	6,371	4,018	1,395	1,100
Kerry	85,285	7,758	24,435	16,542	10 161	10,931	5,651	2,755	3,887	1,328	885	352
Leitrim	46,116	5,439	21,055	7,977	3,382	2,894	1,583	952	1,522	948	704	—
Mayo	120,468	31 007	43,124	11,375	5,262	5,853	3,053	2,098	8,017	5,173	2,343	2,137
Roscommon,	37,477	7,112	15 088	4,535	1,825	1,760	1,097	591	1,924	1,453	873	1,419
Sligo	35,388	4,619	13,955	4,526	2,530	2,089	1,577	755	2,130	2,777	420	—
Total	523,188	102,432	183,704	67,274	35,492	37 343	20,507	11,538	28 677	21 436	8 257	6,468

(IV.)—TABLE showing the Total Population and Population on each of Eleven Classes of Holdings, arranged according to Valuation, in the Congested Districts.

COUNTY	Total Population on Agricultural Holdings	CLASSIFICATION OF HOLDINGS ACCORDING TO RATEABLE VALUATION, AND POPULATION IN EACH CLASS										
		Not exceeding £4	Above £4 and not exceeding £10	Above £10 and not exceeding £15	Above £15 and not exceeding £20	Above £20 and not exceeding £30	Above £30 and not exceeding £40	Above £40 and not exceeding £50	Above £50 and not exceeding £100	Above £100 and not exceeding £200	Above £200 and not exceeding £300	Above £300 in value
Clare,	355	141	71	45	—	16	—	—	—	—	82	—
Cork,	29,465	8,587	12,553	4,381	2,157	1,651	728	353	535	317	8	—
Donegal,	87,772	58,740	27,846	4,538	1,789	1,634	753	280	387	358	131	326
Galway,	82,687	37,074	18,877	2,370	953	1,018	452	441	931	344	107	114
Kerry	68 920	20,076	28,729	10,128	4,754	4,300	1,556	712	830	352	380	134
Leitrim,	30,794	8,061	15,239	3,730	1,107	823	303	182	164	51	43	—
Mayo	120,035	37,868	40,150	5,587	1,895	1,553	545	322	838	572	191	514
Roscommon,	29,053	12,312	12,733	2,067	686	478	193	95	130	133	27	141
Sligo	24,160	8,377	11,392	2,069	830	538	259	87	274	239	25	—
Total	461,247	220,336	163,580	34,924	14 287	12,003	4,790	2,482	4,219	2 412	989	1 229

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV.

F.—STATISTICS OF THE NUMBER, VALUATION, ACREAGE, AND POPULATION OF HOLDINGS IN THE EIGHT COUNTIES AND THE FOUR UNIONS OF CORK WHICH CONTAIN CONGESTED DISTRICTS.

I.—TABLE showing Total Number of Holdings and Number of each of Eleven Classes, arranged according to Valuation, in the following eight Counties and four Unions in Co. Cork.

—	Total Number of Holdings	Classification of Holdings, and Number in each Class										
		Not exceeding £4	Above £4 and not exceeding £10	Above £10 and not exceeding £15	Above £15 and not exceeding £20	Above £20 and not exceeding £30	Above £30 and not exceeding £40	Above £40 and not exceeding £50	Above £50 and not exceeding £100	Above £100 and not exceeding £200	Above £200 and not exceeding £300	Above £300 in value
Donegal,	26,730	14,854	8,355	1,977	1,001	998	524	302	493	177	38	
Galway	31,077	12,953	10,375	2,782	1,284	1,247	614	360	794	435	124	[illegible]
Leitrim,	13,161	3,421	6,188	1,785	731	529	207	103	154	30	11	
Mayo,	32,732	15,887	11,920	2,290	848	606	287	198	393	201	47	
Roscommon,	18,906	5,687	7,762	2,299	935	838	318	190	447	273	83	
Sligo,	13,493	3,511	5,006	1,817	860	704	289	183	321	140	34	
Kerry,	19,096	6'484	5,385	2,474	1,427	1,546	712	366	545	120	20	[illegible]
Clare,	15,757	3,241	5,103	2,653	1,435	1,378	618	309	653	260	94	[illegible]
Bantry, Castletown, Schull, Skibbereen,	7,308	1,784	2,821	1,212	638	517	184	80	103	28	3	
Total	180,320	67,801	63,515	19,269	9,154	8,423	3,753	2,057	3,903	1,670	424	[illegible]

II.—TABLE showing Total Area and Area occupied by each of Eleven Classes of Holdings, arranged according to Valuation, in the following eight Counties and four Unions in Co. Cork.

—	Total Acreage occupied by Agricultural Holdings	Classification of Holdings according to Rateable Valuation, with the Area under each Class										
		Not exceeding £4	Above £4 and not exceeding £10	Above £10 and not exceeding £15	Above £15 and not exceeding £20	Above £20 and not exceeding £30	Above £30 and not exceeding £40	Above £40 and not exceeding £50	Above £50 and not exceeding £100	Above £100 and not exceeding £200	Above £200 and not exceeding £300	Above £300 in value
		Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres	Acres	Acres.	Acres.	Acres
Donegal,	1,016,906	335,970	284,217	89,853	50,106	66,628	38,739	24,361	55,383	44,160	15,926	[illegible]
Galway,	1,290,321	190,169	270,901	108,369	62,613	103,186	69,725	42,030	148,977	135,334	57,890	[illegible]
Leitrim,	328,217	35,855	121,266	55,921	29,591	27,910	16,638	6,135	18,019	8,907	5,072	[illegible]
Mayo,	1,088,044	213,701	315,590	95,123	62,088	72,976	50,424	30,159	98,730	57,064	21,667	[illegible]
Roscommon,	731,605	49,304	124,079	57,928	30,944	37,439	20,250	15,817	54,499	60,026	20,016	[illegible]
Sligo,	385,367	32,106	99,760	49,702	31,179	37,887	21,212	13,023	38,427	34,862	11,446	[illegible]
Kerry,	1,053,841	92,046	287,232	183,952	120,429	141,546	67,393	38,099	76,849	24,794	10,441	[illegible]
Clare,	766,720	37,445	146,222	105,950	72,346	92,599	51,109	35,352	92,267	64,098	25,911	[illegible]
Bantry, Castletown, Schull, Skibbereen	316,705	27,392	95,467	62,305	40,079	40,771	18,710	9,033	15,607	5,697	806	[illegible]
Total	6,783,726	1,014,048	1,744,734	809,143	500,375	621,042	353,200	216,986	596,788	432,942	178,175	[illegible]

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

III.—TABLE showing Total Valuation and Valuation of each of Eleven Classes of Holdings, arranged according to Valuation, in the following eight Counties and four Unions in Co. Cork.

—	Total Valuation.	CLASSIFICATION OF HOLDINGS, AND TOTAL RATEABLE VALUATION OF THOSE IN EACH CASE										
		Not exceeding £4.	Above £4 and not exceeding £10	Above £10 and not exceeding £15	Above £15 and not exceeding £20	Above £20 and not exceeding £30	Above £30 and not exceeding £40	Above £40 and not exceeding £50	Above £50 and not exceeding £100	Above £100 and not exceeding £200	Above £200 and not exceeding £300	Above £300 in value.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Donegal,	250 121	32,735	52,951	24,555	17,508	24,033	18,137	13,533	33,802	24 067	8,202	4,940
Galway,	421,868	29,379	67,160	34,478	22,325	30,614	21,390	16,447	56,114	55,232	29,700	54,853
Leitrim,	127,199	8 835	41,121	22,024	12,636	12,724	7,110	4,647	10,318	3,827	2 794	1,103
Mayo,	283,741	37,339	75,224	28,008	14,800	16,341	9,999	7,041	27,850	27,858	11,152	27,524
Roscommon,	276 346	13,851	51,234	28,407	15,355	20,365	11,011	8,550	31,7 0	37,940	15,887	37,037
Sligo,	181 128	8,476	3,756	22,698	14,369	17,581	10,081	8,222	21,970	20,095	7,600	11,545
Kerry,	248,035	11 917	37,087	30,035	24,856	38,069	24,337	15,403	36,298	15,353	4,749	8,421
Clare,	297,239	6,650	36,008	32,808	25,037	33,701	21,471	13,888	45,248	38,233	15,756	30,588
Bantry, Castletown, Schull, Skibbereen,	84,369	4,251	19,371	14,052	10 991	12,515	8,386	3,582	8,731	3,750	873	1,057
Total,	2,174,046	153,993	417,925	238,905	158,535	208,823	129,922	92,308	269,895	228,425	102,228	174,587

IV.—TABLE showing Total Population and Population of each of Eleven Classes of Holdings, arranged according to Valuation in the following eight Counties and four Unions in Co. Cork.

—	Total Population on Agricultural Holdings.	CLASSIFICATION OF HOLDINGS ACCORDING TO RATEABLE VALUATION, AND POPULATION IN EACH CLASS										
		Not exceeding £4	Above £4 and not exceeding £10	Above £10 and not exceeding £15	Above £15 and not exceeding £20	Above £20 and not exceeding £30	Above £30 and not exceeding £40	Above £40 and not exceeding £50	Above £50 and not exceeding £100	Above £100 and not exceeding £200	Above £200 and not exceeding £300	Above £300 in value
Donegal,	148,881	56,421	40,939	10,423	5,596	8,915	3,850	2,570	8,262	4,006	1,264	646
Galway,	160,007	58,118	53,243	14,982	7,217	6,878	3,438	2,285	5,245	3,478	1,839	3,505
Leitrim,	63,674	12,886	25,329	9,734	4,097	3,160	1,378	818	1,308	385	366	193
Mayo,	174,518	78,271	64,850	13,142	4,838	3,821	1,851	921	2,203	1,839	874	1,848
Roscommon,	61,015	22,344	38,599	11,814	4,972	4,384	1,761	1,028	3,081	2,127	1,054	1,841
Sligo,	68,451	14,721	27,337	8,488	4,569	4,195	2,050	1,437	2,484	1,842	570	758
Kerry,	127,927	32,394	34,823	17,402	10,400	13,127	8,106	3,480	6,242	2,002	700	1,185
Clare,	88,004	12,072	26,087	10,121	8,720	9,165	3,999	2,047	5,124	2,851	1,083	1,746
Bantry, Castletown, Schull, Skibbereen,	46,932	8,331	16,841	7,897	4,606	4,089	1,732	860	1,882	628	26	158
Total,	970,210	305,581	330,039	110,083	55,182	56,754	25,853	15,443	33,821	19,259	7,426	11,878

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX IV

G.—TABLES showing the Number and Poor Law Valuations of (*a*) Holdings not exceeding £10 in rateable value and (*b*) over £100 in rateable value in Connaught, Donegal, Kerry, Clare, and the four Unions of Cork which contain congested districts.

(*a.*)—RETURN showing for certain Counties of Ireland which are either wholly or partly congested, the Number and Valuation of Holdings not exceeding £10 in rateable value, also the Valuation of the Land (1) for increasing the Valuation of such Holdings up to £10, and the Amount and Valuation of Untenanted Land in occupation of owners which may become available for the Enlargement of Small Holdings.

AREA	Holdings not exceeding £10 in Rateable Value (2)		Valuation of Land required to increase to a Uniform Valuation of £10 those Holdings which are under £10 (3)	Untenanted Land in occupation of Owners, as shown in Return prepared by the Commissioner of Valuation in compliance with an Order of the House of Commons, dated March, 1906 (4)		Untenanted Land comprised in Col. 4, excluding Demesnes (5)		Untenanted Land comprised in Col. 4, *less* Demesnes, Bog, Plantation, Mountain, and other lands valued at 2s 6d. an acre and under (6)	
(1.)	Number	Rateable Value		Area	Poor Law Valuation	Area	Poor Law Valuation	Area.	Poor Law Valuation.
		£	£	Acres	£	Acres	£	Acres	£
Donegal,	24,208	80,745	146,335	149,176	15,235	140,728	12,031	21,983	10,461
Cork (Bantry, Castletown, Skibbereen, Schull).	4 605	23,622	22,428	10,765	3,868	6,062	2,456	6,234	2 282
Galway,	23,528	96,538	136,742	320,464	89,720	273,603	68,596	139,175	64,116
Leitrim,	9,609	49,956	46,134	40,562	6 832	37,882	4,754	9,642	3,613
Mayo,	27,787	113,093	164,807	205,546	41,510	183,661	20,693	74,328	27 753
Roscommon,	13 446	65,090	69,400	119,405	42,493	102,520	30,222	47,259	26 904
Sligo,	9,117	46,232	44,658	69,461	22,785	59,677	15,173	22,630	12,788
Clare,	8,644	42,657	40,763	80,264	32,729	68,824	23,362	43,532	21 888
Kerry,	11,869	49,414	69,276	86,844	15,149	79,904	12,297	19,290	14,187
Total for the Congested Counties	131 316	572,317	740,843	1,082,517	270,321	956,167	198,584	384,573	184,262
Total for all Ireland,	275,344	1,254,050	1,499,390	2,555 855	1,034,884	2,138,546	673,543	1,017,879	620,299

(*b.*)—RETURN giving the Number and the Poor Law Valuation of Holdings of a rateable value over £100, situate in the eight Counties and the four Unions of Cork of which portions have been scheduled as Congested

Counties, of which certain portions have been scheduled as Congested	Poor Law Valuation of Holdings of a rateable value of over £100.					
	Total (2)		In landlord's hands (3)		In occupation of tenants and tenant purchasers (4)	
(1)	Number of Holdings	Poor Law Valuation	Number of Holdings	Poor Law Valuation	Number of Holdings	Poor Law Valuation
		£		£		£
Galway,	662	143,661	221	76,964	441	63,667
Leitrim,	43	7,724	17	4,454	26	3,270
Mayo,	303	66,839	97	35,756	206	31,080
Roscommon,	430	94,864	112	39,209	318	55,655
Sligo,	202	36,565	62	20,568	140	19,027
Clare,	387	82,435	101	28,889	286	53,546
Cork (Bantry, Castletown, Skibbereen, Skull).	34	5,490	14	2,788	20	2,702
Kerry,	157	26,523	42	12,708	115	13,815
Donegal,	227	38 209	48	11 757	179	26,452
Total	2,445	505,540	714	236,106	1,731	269,254

NOTE—The figures in column (5) and (6) of Return (*a*) and in column (3) of Return (*b*) are taken from the Tables put in by Mr Finucane, and printed in the Appendix to the Third Report of the Commission [Cd. 3414, 1907] at pp 319 and 323.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

H—TABLES SHOWING NUMBER OF FISHERMEN IN COUNTIES CONTAINING CONGESTED DISTRICTS.

(*a*) RETURN showing the number of Fishermen in each of the Counties containing Congested Districts, according to Table XX. of the County Books of the Census of 1901.

COUNTY.	Total for County	AGES.					
		Under 15 Years	15 and under 20	20 and under 25	25 and under 45	45 and under 65	65 and upwards
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Donegal,	870	5	130	191	372	130	42
Sligo,	167	3	31	34	61	28	10
Mayo,	159	1	29	29	74	22	4
Galway,	919	10	114	205	354	191	45
Kerry,	1,025	12	128	233	480	138	34
Clare,	367	3	37	54	160	83	24
Cork—							
Bantry,							
Castletown,	2,249	—	354*	1,865*	—	—	—
Skibbereen,							
Skull,							
Totals,	5,756	34	848	2,610	1,507	502	159

N.B.—There are no fishermen in Counties Leitrim and Roscommon.

* The number of fishermen in each of the Unions named in Co. Cork is not shown, except under the two headings—(A) "Under 20 years" and (B) "Aged 20 years and upwards." It has therefore, been found necessary to put the number of fishermen "Under 20 years" in Col. 4 and the number of fishermen "Aged 20 years and upwards" in Col. 5 of this Return.

(*b*.)—RETURN showing the number of occupiers of land in each of the Counties containing Congested Districts who are also engaged in Fishing, according to Table XXIII. of the County Books of the Census of 1901.

COUNTY.	Number of occupiers of land who are also engaged in fishing.	Total Number of Fishermen returned in Table A, annexed	Percentage of Farmer-fishermen (Col. 2), to total Number of Fishermen (Col. 3).
(1).	(2)	(3)	(4).
Donegal,	161	870	18·5
Sligo,	37	167	22·2
Mayo,	34	159	21·4
Galway,	102	919	11·1
Kerry,	80	1,025	7·8
Clare,	33	367	9·0
Cork—			
Bantry,			
Castletown,	40*	2,249	1·8
Skibbereen,			
Skull,			
Totals	487	5,756	8·4

N.B.—There are no fishermen in Counties Leitrim and Roscommon.

* There are not separate figures in the Census County Books for *Unions* in the form of Table XXIII., and therefore, the actual number of farmer fishermen for the four Unions cannot be given, but there are in the whole county of Cork only 87 farmer fishermen, and it is estimated that about 40 of them reside in the four Unions under consideration.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

I. RULINGS of COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN on the Dillon Estate. (See Memorandum A put in by the Secretary of the Congested Districts Board for Ireland, and printed in the Appendix to the First Report on page 233.)

(1.) MEMORANDUM to the SECRETARY OF CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD, 16*th December*, 1900.

With reference to the proposed sales on part of this estate, Commissioner O'Brien, before whom the matter is pending, desires me to ask that you will bring this letter before your Board at their next meeting. Copies of the proposed form of agreement have been furnished to him for the purpose of considering whether the completion of the sales might not be expedited by fiating the agreements as provided by section 32 of the Land Act, 1896

The reservation of game, of the right of entry for shooting and preserving, together with the obligation imposed on each purchaser to allow his name to be used in prosecutions under the Game Laws, are so unusual and so contrary to the spirit of the Act of 1896, which is to give purchasers the full and absolute ownership of the land they buy, that Commissioner O'Brien requests that the Congested Districts Board should reconsider the questions of these reservations.

No exceptions or reservations can be put into a Vesting Order unless they have been approved of by the Land Commission, and the Land Commission are satisfied that the effect of such reservation was explained to and understood by the purchasers.

It is presumed that it is intended to give real effect to these reservations, and they appear most objectionable for the following reasons:—

Game preserving is not advantageous, and is generally positively injurious to agriculture In thickly-inhabited districts like this the injury is greater than in opposite circumstances The pursuit of game where enclosures are small causes damage to fences, and shooting is often a danger to the inhabitants and their cattle. Game cannot be preserved without game-keepers, and these are nearly always in a position of hostility to farmers, who resent their right of entry at will upon their farms.

An occasion for ill-will, which in other districts has often led to serious outrages and murders, will be created by the Board setting up a system of game preserving in this district.

It does not appear that any such system has hitherto existed here, that there is any valuable stock of game at present, and that the shooting rights could ever be of any appreciable value or commensurate with the cost of preserving.

The exercise of these rights could not be anything but a nuisance and an injury to tenant purchasers, if the Board does not itself preserve, but allows a game tenant to do so, the matter would be worse, for on small farms it requires the *closest watchfulness to prevent the destruction of game by persons who wish to do so*

The obligation that every purchaser shall allow his name to be used in game prosecutions is calculated to set the whole country by the ears, and to stir up any amount of quarrels among neighbours.

The tenants in this district being particularly poor, and depending on the Congested Districts Board, it is the more incumbent on the Land Commission to be thoroughly satisfied that each purchaser fully understands the full effect of the reservations and the obligation he is required to undertake as to game prosecutions by the Board

Even if understood and assented to by the purchasing tenants, it does not follow that the Land Commission ought to or will assent to the reservations proposed. They are moreover calculated to delay the completion of the sale.

Will you be good enough to have this matter considered by your Board at their next meeting, and convey the final decision to the Land Commission, so that the question of this complication being introduced into the agreements may cause as little delay as possible in the proceedings

I am also to suggest that the paragraph in the agreement forms, "The sale shall be completed by a Vesting Order," might be omitted, as it seems particularly desirable that the completion of the sale shall be expedited, if possible, by fiating the agreements instead of by Vesting Orders.

(2.) MEMORANDUM to the SECRETARY, CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.

DILLON ESTATE.

The 43 agreements received will be sent on for inspection at once, but will not be sanctioned subject to the proposed reservation of game and the right of entry for the vendors, and their assigns, for hunting, coursing, shooting, fishing, and preserving

I have explained verbally to the Members of the Congested Districts Board that I would not approve of these exceptions and reservations for the following reasons:—

1. The Land Law Act contemplates the vesting in purchasers of the full and uncontrolled ownership of their holdings. The proposed exceptions and reservations are a substantial detraction from and diminution of the rights of a landowner.

2. Game preserving is distinctly injurious to agriculture, particularly in a small farm district.

3. Hunting, coursing, and the pursuit of game cause damage to fences and cultivation. Shooting in thickly inhabited districts is often a danger to the inhabitants, their cattle, and poultry.

4. There is no provision insuring compensation to the purchasers for damage done by the exercise of the rights reserved

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

5. There has been no game preserving hitherto, and it is admitted that there is no stock of preservable game at present in this district. Game cannot be preserved without game-keepers, and these are nearly always on bad terms with farmers, who resent their right of entry at will upon their land.

6. The exercise of the rights reserved could never be anything but a nuisance to the purchasers, and might, as it has been elsewhere, be the cause of outrages and disturbances.

7. If the Board let their rights, as contemplated in their Report of last year, they would have no control over the manner in which they might be exercised

8. Before Vesting Orders are made subject to such reservations and exceptions, the Land Commission must be satisfied that the effect of these exceptions and reservations has been explained to and understood by each purchaser. The tenants in this district are unusually poor and dependent on the vendors. It is the more incumbent on the Land Commission to be satisfied that each purchaser fully understands the full effect of the reservations and of the obligations he is required to undertake as to game prosecutions.

9. With regard to par. 2 of the agreement, this is neither an exception nor reservation, but a contract by the purchaser to allow his name to be used in game prosecutions against any and everybody, but probably against his neighbours. This is calculated to set the whole country by the ears, and to stir up any amount of quarrels and bad feeling.

10. The inspection and vesting of the holdings will be much delayed by the introduction of these complications into the contracts and Vesting Orders.

11. It is to be noted that game preserving, hunting and coursing are not named among the purposes for which statutory powers are given to the Congested Districts Board.

I understand that the Congested Districts Board wish to appeal against my refusal to approve of the exceptions and reservations, and in order that my refusal may not delay the sales, as it would if made on sanctioning the agreements, an order will be made at once refusing generally to approve of the exceptions and reservations in the agreements lodged. But I again suggest to the Congested Districts Board that it would facilitate the sales, expedite their completion, be more consistent with the useful and benevolent purposes for which the Board was created, and be more likely to lead to the effectual preservation of such game as can exist in this district, for the Board after the completion of the sales, when the purchasers are freer agents than at present, to make some amicable arrangement with them as to the sporting, than to compel their tenants by making it a condition of sale to agree to such a restriction on their rights of ownership.

If the Board are going to appeal against my decision on the general principle, I suggest that they should do so at once, but it must be remembered that, apart from the general principle, if it appears that any individual purchaser has not understood the effect of the exceptions, &c., and has not knowingly assented to them, I shall refuse to approve of the reservation in that case.

The Inspectors will be directed to ascertain from each purchaser whether the effect of the reservation has been understood.

M. O'BRIEN.

30th January, 1901.

J.—Correspondence with the Secretary of the Congested Districts Board for Scotland.

Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland.

29, Bury-street,
St. James's, London, S.W.,
24th March, 1908.

Sir,

I am directed by the Commission to send you the enclosed memorandum of points respecting the treatment of sporting rights by your Board, on which they would be glad to get information. As the Commission is now sitting, it would greatly add to the favour you will confer upon them if you could communicate with me during the course of the next week

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

WALTER CALLAN.
Secretary.

The Secretary,
Congested Districts Board for Scotland,
Edinburgh.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

MEMORANDUM REFERRED TO IN FOREGOING LETTER

1. As to method of dealing with sporting rights. When the Board buy a property for purpose of relieving congestion do they always buy the sporting rights, or is it a matter of arrangement, as between the owner and the Board, whether the sporting rights remain vested in the vendor or pass to the Board?

2. If they remain vested in the former owner, what is the nature of arrangements to prevent the crofters settled by the Board on the property from interfering with the preservation of game and fish?

3. If the sporting rights become vested in the Board—

(*a*) Do they subsequently vest sporting rights (power to take and kill game and fish) in the occupier settled on the land?

(*b*) If so, are these rights conveyed by the Board to the occupier for nothing, or have the occupiers to pay for them, and, if so, how?—*e.g.*, do they purchase outright or pay an annual rent?

If the sporting rights are not vested in the occupier by the Board.

(*c*) Do the Board retain all the exclusive rights of sporting and the taking of game and fish, exercised by the former owner, and is any power reserved by the Board to punish by ejectment or otherwise interference with game or fish or their preservation?

(*d*) How do the Board deal with the rights they retain?—*i.e.*, do they lease them?

4. It would be most valuable to have from the Board for Scotland a general outline of the principle and practice of procedure in respect of game, fish, sporting rights and preservation, and a general sketch of its results as affecting the national interests in the game and fish.

N.B.—At page 5 of the Eighth Report of the Congested Districts Board for Scotland there is an account of the terms proposed to crofters to purchase holdings on the estate of Kilmuir, by which it appears that the price of the land was to be 20 years, the price of sporting rights if and when sold to be 16 years, an annuity was to be charged not merely on the price of the holding, but also on "shootings."

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD,

Edinburgh, 27*th March*, 1908.

SIR,

Before replying in detail to the points in the Memorandum which accompanied your letter of the 24th March, regarding sporting rights on the properties purchased by the Congested Districts Board for Scotland, I may explain first as regards killing game that legal authorities appear to agree that the right to kill any game in Scotland is an incident of the right of property in land. This right may be delegated either gratuitously or for payment. It is doubtful whether it can be permanently alienated *in toto*, but it would appear from a case decided in March, 1896, by the Court of Session that the right may be communicated as a servitude in favour of neighbouring lands.

This case is reported in Vol. 23 of Rettie's Reports of cases decided in the Court of Session, 1896, and shortly was as follows:—

In 1808 Innes, proprietor of Ballogie, was infeft in that Estate with a right of fowling in the Forest of Birse, which belonged to the Earl of Aboyne.

In 1896 the Court of Session held that the proprietor of Ballogie was entitled (1) to let his right of shootings in the Forest to any persons whether they were or were not tenants on Ballogie; and (2) to sell the game killed by him for sport.

Fishings.

The right of salmon fishing belongs to the Crown as a separate heritable estate. The right may be given out by the Crown either with the land or separately. Persons now in right of salmon fishings must have acquired these rights by grant from the Crown, either to themselves or to their predecessors. Trout fishing appears to require no express grant or prescriptive possession, but passes, in the cases of private rivers or lakes, as a part and pertinent of the land. The right may, however, be reserved or given out expressly to another, who is not proprietor of the land.

To deal now with the points as numbered in your Memorandum:

1. As to method of dealing with sporting rights. In all cases of purchase of land by the Board they have also acquired the right to kill game, and, with one exception, the fishing rights.

In this exceptional case the block of land purchased by the Board in Sutherlandshire is bounded on the east side by the famous salmon river Naver, and on the north and south sides by smaller streams, tributaries of the Naver. In the conveyance of the estate to the Board the fishing rights were reserved by the Duke of Sutherland.

2. If they remain vested in the former owner, what is the character of arrangements to prevent the crofters settled by the Board on the property from interfering with the preservation of game and fish?

In the case of the Board the above is the only instance of reservation, and the preservation of fish in the Naver is a matter for the owner of the fishings.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

3. If the sporting rights become vested in the Congested Districts Board (*a*) do they vest sporting rights (and power to take and kill game or fish) in the occupier settled on the land? (*b*) If so, are these rights conveyed by the Congested Districts Board to the occupier for nothing, or have the occupiers to pay for their acquirement, and if so, how? *e.g.*, purchase out-right, or annual rent?

In purchasing the estates the value of the sporting rights acquired by the Board from the original vendor forms part of the price paid to him by the Board, and when the estate is re-sold to the settlers, the value of these sporting rights is taken into account in the price fixed for the re-sale of the whole subjects to the community settled upon the estate.

These lands in the Highlands consist partly of arable land lotted out into small individual holdings, and partly of hill pasture, held by the Township in common. The grazing on this common pasture and other matters connected with the common property of the Township are managed by a Committee. The sporting rights are part of the common property, and the rent obtained for the sporting rights goes into the common purse, and is divisible according to the shares in the common possessed by each occupier.

Of course, the value of the sporting rights and the rent paid for them by the tenant or tenants vary according to the quality of the sport to be obtained. In no case does the individual occupier retain any sporting rights himself. In all cases these are let and the community really come in place of the single owner.

The settlers pay for the sporting rights just as they pay for other rights in the property. The method of repayment to the Board is by a terminable annuity, usually for fifty years, whereby principal and interest at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. are repaid by an annuity of £3 14*s.* 1*d.* for each £100 of the price.

4. It would be most valuable to have from the Congested Districts Board for Scotland a general outline of the principle and practice of procedure in respect of game, fish, sporting rights and preservation and a general sketch of its results as affecting the National interests in the game and fish

The actual experience of the Board is not very great in this matter, but, so far as it goes, they think that settlers are quite alive to the value of their sporting rights and do all they can to keep up the quality of the shootings.

A Township Committee is an awkward body for a man who wants a moor, or his agent, to deal with. Accordingly, in practice the negotiations for sporting leases have hitherto been conducted by the Land Manager of the Board, who has been able to make advantageous arrangements for the leases, and who advises the various committees in all the details that good management of shootings requires.

From their knowledge of shootings and fishings in crofting districts generally in the Highlands, the Board do not think that any interests in game and fish suffer greatly from the presence of small holders. There may, of course, be cases where men poach or otherwise do injury, but there are very good shootings in Scotland over crofter grounds.

With reference to the note at the end of the Memorandum. Matters were not quite ripe in Kilmuir for the sale of the whole estate, including farm lands and crofters' holdings, to settlers. The Board began by offering to sell their holdings to the small tenants on the estate. If and when this was adjusted, and the farm lands sold to new settlers, the Board proposed to re-arrange the shootings on the estate, so that certain of the townships under the new arrangement might be grouped together as the owners of the shootings over their lands. This is no departure from the general principle, but a necessary expedient to enable the sporting rent of a certain area to be allocated to the townships, new or old, to whom that area will belong.

I hope this information may meet the points of the Commission, but I shall be very glad to give you any further particulars I can.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

R. R. M'GREGOR,
Secretary.

WALTER CALLAN, Esq.,
Secretary,
Royal Commission on Congestion
in Ireland,
London.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

K.—SCHOOL GARDENS IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

Report of a Conference between the Board of National Education and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland.

A conference between representatives of the Board of National Education and of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction was held at Tyrone House, Marlborough-street, on Tuesday, 17th December, 1907.

The proceedings commenced at 12 o'clock.

There were present:—

Mr. W. J. M. Starkie, M.A., Litt.D., Resident Commissioner of National Education; Reverend Henry Evans, D.D., Most Reverend Patrick Foley, D.D., Lord Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin; Lieut-General Sir William F. Butler, G.C.B.; Mr. W. J. Dilworth (Secretary), *representing the Commissioners of National Education.*

Mr. T. W. Russell, M.P., Vice-President Department of Agriculture, &c.; Mr. T. P. Gill; Professor J. R. Campbell; Mr. George Fletcher; Mr. J. D. Daly, *representing the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.*

(Mr. W. M. Heller, Organising Inspector of Science under the Board of National Education, was also present during portion of the proceedings).

The conference was held in accordance with the following recommendation made by the Consultative Committee of Education, at their meeting on 15th November, 1907:—

"That the Department should consider, in consultation with the National Education Board, the feasibility of arranging some special courses in Horticulture suitable for teachers in rural schools; and that they should also consider whether it would be practicable to make arrangements whereby the services of the horticultural instructors employed under the county agricultural schemes could be utilised for supervising and otherwise assisting such instruction."

After a full discussion, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

I.—Course for Teachers in the Training Colleges.

1. That there should be included in the curriculum of the training colleges under the Board of National Education a course of practical instruction intended to fit National Teachers for managing and giving instruction in connection with school gardens.

2. That special instructors for this course should be added to the regular staffs of the training colleges.

3. That the land requisite for plots should be provided at the training colleges.

4. That the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction should assist in this work by supervising the instruction, and inspecting and reporting on it to the Board of National Education.

II.—Courses for Teachers already in National Schools.

1. That where, in the judgment of the Department and the County Committees of Agriculture, the regular work of the Horticultural Instructors under county schemes permits, these Instructors should be utilised for the purpose of training National teachers at central classes, and for organising school gardens in connection with the National Schools; and that, where necessary, special funds should be provided to enable the County Committee to employ an additional Horticultural Instructor for the purpose.

2. That the land and premises of the Department's Agricultural Schools should be utilised, where practicable, for these classes.

3. That the Board of National Education should provide for the travelling expenses of National Teachers attending such central classes in horticulture.

III.—School Gardens for National Schools.

1. That the Local Authorities should be empowered to acquire land compulsorily, where necessary, for the purpose of school garden and agricultural teaching in connection with National Schools.

2. That the Board of National Education should provide for such equipment (tools, tool-house, seeds, manures, &c.), as might be necessary for the efficient working of each school garden.

3. That the Board of National Education should provide fees for qualified National Teachers who give school garden instruction under approved conditions.

4. That the inspection of the school garden work should be undertaken for the Board of National Education by the Department of Agriculture.

IV.—Agricultural Instruction at National Schools.

1. That the teaching of agriculture, as distinct from school garden teaching, in schools under the Board of National Education, should be undertaken only in a school organised as an upper primary centre to which pupils from the National Schools in the neighbourhood could come.

2. That the course should be given by the Agricultural Instructor of the County Committee, or by specially trained teachers under his direction, and working under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

V.—Application to the Treasury.

That an application be forthwith made to the Treasury, both by the Board of National Education and by the Department, for the funds necessary for each, to enable them to carry out their respective shares of the joint scheme of work outlined in the foregoing resolutions.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

L.—STATISTICS AS TO EXPENDITURE ON LABOURERS' COTTAGES.*

TABLE showing the Valuation, the number of Labourers' Cottages (built or in course of construction), amount of Loans (sanctioned and received), Exchequer contributions for the year 1906, and other particulars in respect of Labourers' Cottages in the eight counties and four unions of Cork which contain congested districts.

Area	Valuation	Number of Labourers' Cottages		Amount of Loans.		Amount required to be raised annually in repayment of Loans sanctioned	Amount which would be raised by the maximum rate of one shilling in the pound allowed for purposes of Acts.	Rate per pound required to raise Amount specified in Col. 6	Amount of Exchequer contribution for the year ended 31st March, 1906.	Amount of rent received from tenants of cottages and plots during year ended 31st March, 1906.
		Built.	In course of Construction	Sanctioned	Received					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	£			£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Donegal,	305,875	192	39	57,251 0 0	50,589 8 10	2,316 17 8	15,293 15 0	1·82	1,401 18 2	792 8 11
Sligo,	191,892	41	11	6,645 0 0	6,041 0 0	135 15 6	9,594 12 0	·17	38 0 0	97 10 8
Leitrim,	138,575	112	8	22,375 10 0	16,199 12 10	944 3 8	6,928 15 0	1·64	449 1 4	201 2 6
Mayo,	301,366	—	—	—	—	—	15,068 6 0	—	—	—
Roscommon,	301,507	139	38	35,526 15 0	27,721 5 0	1,540 7 0	15,075 7 0	1·23	838 12 5	415 12 7
Galway,	441,391	44	9	9,858 15 3	8,973 15 0	310 11 2	22,069 11 0	·17	557 0 0	89 14 4
Clare,	318,118	511	8	77,458 19 8	70,413 11 5	3,501 6 4	15,955 18 0	2·68	1,408 4 10	1,008 4 7
Kerry,	278,881	688	25	105,220 17 10	96,799 1 10	4,893 18 0	13,944 1 0	4·21	1,758 13 10	1,670 18 1
Cork —										
Bantry,	23,768	28	—	3,577 0 0	3,577 0 0	176 14 0	1,188 8 0	1·78	41 9 5	84 11 9
Castletown,	12,408	—	—	—	—	—	620 8 0	—	—	—
Schull,	15,581	39	—	4,278 0 0	3,934 0 0	189 18 8	779 1 0	2·93	29 18 0	69 11 7
Skibbereen,	42,928	265	6	36,118 0 0	31,720 0 0	1,444 13 10	2,146 8 0	8·08	198 17 1	502 16 10
	2,367,290	2,051	142	358,309 17 10	315,735 14 11	15,454 5 10	118,364 10 0	1·58	8,718 15 10	5,089 0 8

* As given in Parliamentary Paper No. 194 of 1906.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V

APPENDIX V

CORRESPONDENCE between the CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD and the IRISH GOVERNMENT

(Continued from Appendix to First Report of the Commission, [Cd. 3267—1906], *p.* 262.)

Letter No. 8.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD FOR IRELAND,
23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,
15*th April*, 1907.

ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

SIR,

I am directed by the Congested Districts Board to submit for transmission to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury their Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure for the year 1907-8.

In the Board's letters of 9th October, 1905, and 30th April, 1906, in reference to their financial position, they pointed out that their income was insufficient for the preparation for sale of the estates which had been purchased, or must be purchased, if reasonable progress was to be made in this branch of their work.

The crisis which it was anticipated would occur in 1907-8 has been postponed to 1908-9 owing to the delay in recovering the "enhanced values" of the estates purchased prior to the Act of 1903. In consequence of this delay, the sum available for the improvement of the estates purchased under the Act of 1903 was so largely reduced that in the past year a stay was placed on the execution of improvement works, and only £75,000 was expended out of £108,000 estimated, and although £110,000 is provided for in the year 1907-8 for the improvement of 115 estates, a balance of £40,000 required to complete the preparation of these estates for sale must be deferred to the year 1908-9 owing to the want of funds.

The enclosed estimates for Estates transactions have been framed in strict accordance with the conditions laid down by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury in their letter of the 28th February, 1906—that is, the sum to be borrowed from the Board of Works on each estate has been limited, first by the rule that it shall not exceed the sum to be recovered on re-sale (in excess of the Land Commission advance), and, secondly that it shall not exceed two-thirds of the estimated improvement expenditure under the specified Heads. Subject to these conditions only £47,000 can be borrowed in the coming year on the estates which are being prepared for sale and the Board are enabled to provide for an expenditure of £110,000 (on improvements) only by the estimated receipt of £123,000 for resale values of the older estates, and £35,000 for enhanced value of the newer estates which will be sold in the year. This latter sum would at once be paid to the Board of Works in reduction of the £101,000 which will then have been borrowed, if the position of the Board's funds would permit. Two causes will, however, make this impossible, one being the want of the additional income for the two years 1906-7 and 1907-8 which they declared to be necessary, the other being the higher percentage of loss on estate operations; this was estimated at 8 per cent. in the Board's letter of the 30th April last, but it is now anticipated that it will reach an average of 12 per cent. on the properties purchased since the passing of the Act of 1903. In view of these difficulties, the Board intend to proceed as far as possible with the preparation of the estates for sale, but they cannot, even on the favourable view of the probable re-sales which has been taken in the estimate, and after borrowing the full amount that the regulations permit, provide for more than 70 per cent. of the required expenditure on improvements they desire to carry out in the year, and at its close their liabilities in respect of estates will exceed the assets by about £32,000.

With regard to the progress which has been made in dealing with the estates, I am to report as follows:—

Of the thirty-nine estates purchased prior to the Act of 1903, there have been completely sold fourteen, with sale prices amounting to £56,924, and the remaining twenty-five, sale prices amounting to £586,787, have been sold, with the exception of fragments valued in all at £64,364. These sales represent the value of agreements signed by tenants, but about £60,000 for these sales has not yet been advanced by the Land Commission.

Of the 107 estates bought under the Act of 1903 one has been completely sold for £835, five with estimated sale prices of £42,273 have been sold, with the exception of fragments amounting to £7,506, one will be sold immediately for about £22,019, and seventy-seven, which cost £660,742, are now being prepared for sale in current year leaving thirty, which cost £619,340 to be completed and sold after the 31st March, 1908.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

The united prices of the estates purchased under the Act up to date is £1,280,082, including fifteen purchases amounting to £106,893, which have been agreed upon in the year 1906-7.

A Statement of the Board's probable assets and liabilities in regard to Estates at 31st March, 1908, is enclosed.

The general cash balance at the close of the year 1907-8 has not been included.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D. MITCHELL.

The Under Secretary,

Dublin Castle.

STATEMENT OF BOARD'S PROBABLE ASSETS AND LIABILITIES IN RESPECT OF ESTATES ON 31ST MARCH, 1908.

On the 1st April, 1908, the Board's account in respect of estates will stand as follows:

Liabilities.

(*a*) Balance of expenditure necessary to prepare estates for sale excluding twenty-two recent purchases,	£21,000
(*b*.) Due to the Board of Works on loans for improvement of estates bought under Act of 1903,	£101,000
(*c*.) Estimated loss at 12 per cent on twenty-two estates purchased for £126,000,	£15,000
	£137,000

Assets.

(*d*.) Enhanced value receivable from Land Commission on estates not sold at 1st April, 1908 (excluding (*c*),	£83,000
(*e*.) Price of estates bought by Board without advances from Land Commission,	£8,000
(*f*.) Price of holdings bought and not included in (*d*),	£6,000
(*g*) Value of cattle on grass lands,	£8,000
	£105,000
Deficit,	£32,000
	£137,000

F. W. D. MITCHELL.

Letter No. 9.

DUBLIN CASTLE, 23*rd May*, 1907.

Immediate.

SIR,

With reference to your letter of the 15th ultimo relative to the Estimates for your Board for the year 1907-8, I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit, to be laid before the Congested Districts Board, copy of a letter from the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury on the subject.

Having regard to the terms of this letter His Excellency suggests for the Board's consideration that it is undesirable to prosecute any large purchases and that only specially suitable grass lands should be bought, and that only within the limit indicated.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

J. B. DOUGHERTY.

The Secretary,

Congested Districts Board.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V.

Enclosure for Letter No. 9.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,

17th May, 1907.

SIR,

I have laid before the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury Sir J. Dougherty's letter of the 18th ultimo (8252), transmitting by direction of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant the Estimates of the Congested Districts Board for Ireland for 1907-8.

My Lords observe that the estimated liabilities of the Board on the 31st March next exceed the estimated assets (excluding the general cash balance) by £32,000, a result which this Board attribute in part to the increased percentage of loss on estates purchased since the passing of the Act of 1903, and in part to insufficiency of funds.

But My Lords have already in previous letters called attention to the obligation which rests upon the Congested Districts Board, as upon all other public Departments, of confining their operations within the limits imposed by the funds supplied them by Parliament, and Their Lordships must therefore ask for a full statement, by way of forecast of the position for 1908-9, and if necessary for later years, showing how it is proposed, on the basis of the existing resources of the Board, to balance the statement of Assets and Liabilities.

My Lords observe also that the Board in their letter of the 15th October last stated that, until the result of the Royal Commision on Congestion has been announced, they would not purchase further lands except such as may be specially suitable for their purposes, and they estimated that £50,000 would cover such special cases. But the estimate of the Board's requirements for Land Purchase for this calendar year as submitted to the Estates Commissioners was £670,000. No explanation is given of this apparent change of policy; nor can My Lords understand (in view of the figures given in your letter (5384) of 11th May, 1906, and its enclosures) how the Board can hope with their existing resources to deal with fresh purchases to anything like this extent.

Unless My Lords can be satisfied on the above points, They would not feel justified in sanctioning the Estimates for 1907-8 as submitted.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

G. H. MURRAY.

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

Letter No. 10.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD FOR IRELAND,

23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,

17th June, 1907.

SIR,

I am directed by the Congested Districts Board to acknowledge the receipt of Sir James Dougherty's letter of the 23rd ultimo, enclosing copy of Treasury letter of the 17th idem on the subject of the Board's Estimate for 1907-8.

The Board desire to refer briefly to the preceding correspondence in order to make the present situation more clear and definite. The Secretary to the Treasury in his letter of 8th August, 1905, criticising the Board's Estimate of Receipts and Expenditure for 1905-6 suggested to the Lord Lieutenant that the Board should be restricted from entering into agreements for the purchase of any more estates until it should appear that the purchase money could be provided within a reasonable time from the date of the agreement in each case, and until the estates already bought, or agreed to be bought, had been so far disposed of as to make it clear that the Board might safely embark on fresh transactions.

In considering these instructions from the Treasury, the Board in its letter of the 9th October, 1905, discussed the extent of its Land Purchase operations both before the Act of 1903 and afterwards, up to the date of the letter, and indicated the sources from which the money necessary for the improvement of the estates before resale would be available. The gist of the Board's explanation was that (1) the re-sale of the estates purchased before the Act of 1903 came into force would be completed by the 31st March, 1906, and would leave the Board in possession of £64,382, which would then be available for dealing with the estates bought under the Act of 1903; (2) with this sum of £64,382 in addition to the Board's normal income it was estimated that the Board would be able to carry out the necessary improvement works on these estates for the ensuing two years on the estates bought under the Act of 1903 (representing in value about £1,200,000), and with further purchases to the extent of £300,000 in each of the years 1906-7 and 1907-8.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

The preceding estimate of receipts for the year 1906-7 has not been realised owing to delays in clearing the sales through the Land Commission, and difficulties incident to the sale of the estates, and it may be stated broadly that the £64,382 has not been realised, but it falls for realisation in the current year, as shown in the Budget Estimates already submitted to the Treasury.

For the last year, therefore, the Board's operations in preparing for sale the estates purchased since 1903 have been greatly restricted. It was estimated that estates to the value of about £600,000 would be prepared for re-sale in the current year, but it is improbable that this estimate will be worked up to owing to the Board's ordinary income, supplemented by the recoveries on re-sale, as explained above, being inadequate to its wants.

In view of this curtailment of their available means for dealing with property after purchase, the Board have restricted their purchases in the last year to £108,861, instead of £300,000, and in the current year they have arranged terms for the purchase of only £78,000 worth of estates, which were, in the opinion of the Board, of a desirable character to acquire.

The Board fully appreciate the necessity of restricting its purchases if its income is to remain at its present figure, but this hypothesis, in the Board's opinion, ought not to be insisted upon. I am to forward *herewith copy of a resolution which the Board recorded at their meeting yesterday*, and to invite for it the earliest attention. It is not too much to say that on the answer which the Government will give to the Board's application for extended powers of purchase and for an increased income will depend its usefulness as a body in future.

In conclusion, I am to refer to the remark in the Treasury letter that the inclusion of the sum of £675,000 in the estimate for the Land Commission in December last as the amount of advances which the Board might require during the current year indicated a change of policy on their part and an intention to purchase land far beyond the limit of £300,000 suggested for this year in their letter of 9th October, 1905. I am to explain that of the sum of £675,000 a sum of £130,000 was for advances to tenants on re-sale of estates purchased before the Act of 1903, while £363,000 was for the payment for estates which had been already bought, and which were included in the £1,200,000 worth of property in hand. Only £182,000 were for new purchases, which was obviously well within the £300,000 limit previously referred to.

I am further to observe that the £50,000 referred to in the same paragraph of Their Lordships' letter of 17th May must be taken as an addition to the £184,764 mentioned in the Board's previous letter of 15th October, the resulting aggregate of £234,764 being the limit to which the Board desired to work up to in that year. As pointed out above, the Board in point of fact only purchased estates worth £108,861 last year and £78,000 this year. It will therefore be evident that the limits proposed under the circumstances then existing, whether by the Board or by the Treasury, have not been exceeded.

Finally, in reference to the Treasury demand for a forecast of the position in 1908-9, I am instructed to say that the Board find it impossible to make any forecast at this time of what their precise financial position will be in the ensuing year. This much, however, may be said, that if the £64,382 recoverable on the re-sale of estates purchased before 1903 are brought to account this year, and expended as in the estimate, the amount which the Board can lose on the improvement of estates before re-sale will apparently not exceed £11,000, and that its funds must therefore be altogether inadequate for effective work next year.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D. MITCHELL.

The Under Secretary,

Dublin Castle.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD FOR IRELAND.

Resolution passed by the Congested Districts Board on 14th June, 1907.—

At the meeting held to-day the Board had under consideration the correspondence which passed between the Treasury, the Irish Government, and the Board since August, 1905. Without entering into details, the Board find the effect of this correspondence to be a limitation to some £11,000 per annum of their income available for the improvement of uneconomic holdings and for the migration of tenants, and consequently a practical suspension of their purchase operations. This limitation and the consequent suspension may have been desirable last year when conditions in the Congested Districts were different from what they are at present. But the circumstances of the country are now such that the maintenance of this suspension of the Board's activities will, beyond doubt, have a most injurious effect not only upon the operations and influence of the Board, but upon the peace of the scheduled districts. The Board are clearly of the opinion that the circumstances of the time call, not for a restriction, but for a large ex-

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V. tension of purchase operations in Connaught, especially in regard to grass lands The Board may hold grass land up to the value of a million sterling for five years, paying interest only on the purchase money, and they have no doubt that they can easily recover such interest and more from the grazing even if they considered it desirable not to distribute the land earlier. They consider that they should be enabled forthwith to enter into negotiations with landlords of grass lands who are willing to sell, at all events to the extent of £500,000 within the current year They also consider that their operations in regard to the purchase of ordinary tenanted and congested estates should proceed up to at least the average of purchases for the previous three years There are many congested estates which they should acquire *pari passu* with the acquisition of the grass land. While the Board consider that their liberty to purchase should thus be restored to them, they are also clearly of the opinion that the funds available for the improvement of estates should be correspondingly increased—in other words, that the £11,000, now available for this purpose, should be increased to not less than £50,000 It is to be remembered that this work of land purchase, migration, and improvement must be done at one time or another, or by one department or another, and that it is in truth an economical procedure and one urgently called for by the actual condition of the country to do the work expeditiously rather than prolong it over a series of years In conclusion, the Board cannot too earnestly press upon the attention of Government the serious state of portions of the scheduled districts subject to their jurisdiction, and the urgent necessity which exists for the immediate application of the remedial measures indicated above.

Letter No. 11.

23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,

20th July, 1907.

SIR,

With reference to the letter of the Congested Districts Board dated 15th ultimo, forwarding for the consideration of His Excellency a resolution on the subject of the purchase of land for the relief of congestion and on the state of their funds, I am directed to transmit herewith a copy of a further resolution passed at a meeting of the Board on the 19th inst., and to request that His Excellency may be pleased to recommend the matters referred to in these resolutions to the favourable consideration of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D MITCHELL.

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

Resolution passed by the Congested Districts Board on 19*th July*, 1907 —

Read again the resolution recorded by the Board at their meeting on the 14th June. Although no answer to the points submitted by the Board in that resolution has yet been received from the Treasury the Board are informed by the Under Secretary, who presided at to-day's meeting, that the Treasury are willing that they should proceed with the purchase of those grass lands which are most suitably situated for their purpose, and which, having regard to the conditions prevailing in the West, it is most desirable to acquire at the earliest date.

The Board desire to impress upon the Irish Government the great necessity which exists of altogether removing the embargo upon the operation of their general powers of purchase, and while appreciating the relaxation of previous restrictions in regard to the purchase of grass lands they desire to bring under special notice the fact that in regard to property valued at £415,450, negotiations had been begun and had proceeded to a considerable length before this restriction had been imposed. While admitting the great desirability of buying those grass lands at once, the Board think it clear that owners of estates with whom negotiations have been entered into will find a legitimate ground for complaint if the purchase of their estates is postponed while other properties are purchased. Such action would tend to have an unsettling effect upon the general purchase operations of the Board.

The Board also desire to point out that lands which ought to be sold to them are passing to tenant purchasers in an unimproved condition, whereby the security of repayment of Government loans is seriously imperilled and congestion is stereotyped.

In conclusion, the Board again desire to express their satisfaction at the statement as regards the purchase of grass lands made to them by the Under Secretary, and they trust that the necessity upon which they dwelt in their resolution referred to above for an adequate increase in their funds will now receive equally sympathetic treatment from the Treasury.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Letter No. 12.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD FOR IRELAND,

23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,

12*th August*, 1907.

Purchase of Estates.

SIR,

I am directed by the Congested Districts Board to again call the attention of Government to their resolution of 20th ultimo, which pointed out that the Board had entered into negotiations for the purchase of estates estimated to cost £415,450.

While the Board have gladly acknowledged the authority given them to proceed with the purchase of grass lands necessary for the relief of congestion, and are taking steps to effect such purchases, they feel they would be wanting in their duty if they did not very earnestly press on the Government the necessity of also completing the purchase of those estates, in reference to which negotiations have been suspended. It must be remembered that the Board can only utilise the grass lands for enlarging uneconomic holdings, and that this presupposes the purchase of such holdings on a large scale. It is true that the Board have on their hands congested estates, but they desire to purchase more.

The Board therefore trust that His Excellency may be pleased to represent to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury the very great importance of allowing them liberty to proceed with the purchase of those tenanted estates in the congested districts, at all events, those estates in respect of which negotiations had been begun before the orders suspending the Board's purchase operations had been issued. The estimated purchase price of those estates is about £400,000 It is probable that only a small portion of this sum would require to be issued during the current financial year.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D. MITCHELL.

The Under Secretary,

Dublin Castle.

Letter No. 13.

CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE,

DUBLIN CASTLE,

2*nd September*, 1907.

SIR,

With reference to your letters of the 17th June, 20th July, and 12th instant, dealing with questions of land purchase, I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit, for submission to the Congested Districts Board, copy of a letter from the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury authorising the Board to open negotiations with the owners of grazing lands which they desire to acquire for the purpose of enlarging uneconomic holdings.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

J. B. DOUGHERTY

The Secretary,

Congested Districts Board.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V

Enclosure in Letter 13.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,
29*th August*, 1907.

SIR,

With reference to your letters of the 17th June, 20th ultimo, and 20th instant (13229, 16101, 17924), I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury to request you to inform His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant that they authorise the opening of negotiations by the Congested Districts Board with the owners of the grazing lands which it is desired to acquire for the purpose of enlarging uneconomic holdings. My Lords presume that the Board will proceed with the utmost caution in these negotiations, and will not go beyond the absolute necessities of the moment.

When the negotiations have made sufficient progress My Lords would be glad to receive a report on the subject before any purchases are finally decided on, and to be informed of the approximate amount involved in the transactions, both for purchase and for loss on re-sale

As regards the general question of an increase in the income of the Congested Districts Board for the purpose of improving estates, My Lords are not prepared to arrive at a decision until They have before Them the Report of the Commission which is now enquiring into the operations of the Board.

I am, &c.,

G H MURRAY.

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

Letter No. 14.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD FOR IRELAND,
23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,
16*th September*, 1907.

SIR,

I am directed by the Congested Districts Board to state that at their meeting to-day they considered Sir James Dougherty's letter of the 2nd instant, enclosing copy of a letter dated 29th ultimo from the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury in reply to the Board's application of the 12th August for authority to proceed with the purchase of estates, containing both tenanted and untenanted land for which negotiations have been commenced.

I am to express the Board's great regret that the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury have ignored the strong remonstrance made by the Board against the total suspension of their purchases of the tenanted estates referred to in their letter of the 12th ultimo, for which negotiations had been entered into, and the owners of which are pressing for definite replies to their offers to sell.

In some cases the tenants are aware that their landlords have offered their estates to the Board, and there is good reason to believe that the rents will be withheld if no steps are taken to purchase. I am to enclose a copy of a Report furnished to the Board by their Chief Land Inspector, Mr. Henry Doran, calling attention to the urgent necessity of proceeding with the negotiations in some of these cases.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D. MITCHELL.

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

Enclosure in Letter No. 14.

Re Provision of Purchase Money of Estates.

SECRETARY,

The Treasury letter, of which you sent me a copy, appears to convey that the Board cannot make any purchases, except of estates comprising untenanted lands.

If this be so, and that the Board must now abandon the negotiations opened for the purchase of such very desirable estates as the Lynch-Blosse, E. Thomas O'Donel, O'Conor's of Cloonmore, M'Dermott, and others on the list submitted to the Treasury, I feel it necessary to inform the Board that in my opinion if they withdraw from negotiations for

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

the purchase of these estates it is certain there will be a refusal by the tenants, except perhaps in the case of the Lynch-Blosse, to pay rents at the approaching collection in November, and there will probably be serious disorder in the districts in which they are situate.

The owners have offered to sell these estates, and the tenants are very anxious to buy. There is a considerable area of grass lands on each of these estates which can be acquired for the enlargement of holdings.

There has been a police hut on one of the grass farms on the Cloonmore (O'Conor's) estate for several years past, and the agent has several decrees against the tenants for rent unpaid.

The Board are tenants of four grass farms on the E. T. O'Donel estate, which they acquired the occupation interest of from three to seven years ago in anticipation of acquiring the fee-simple, and on several occasions in reply to Parliamentary questions it has been stated that the Board intended to offer for the estate, and had taken the necessary preliminary steps in the Land Judge's Court to lodge their offer when the estate was ready for sale.

After waiting for several years the estate was not offered to them until a couple of months ago, and it will be a very objectionable proceeding if they are now compelled to withdraw from negotiations.

I may also point out that except in Land Judge's cases, such as O'Donel and M'Dermott estates, no money would be required either for purchase or improvement expenditure for at least six months after terms of purchase have been agreed upon, as the legal proceedure, preliminary to vesting of estates, usually takes six to twelve months.

H. DORAN.

12/9/07.

Letter No. 15.

DUBLIN CASTLE,
30th October, 1907.

SIR,

With reference to your letter of the 16th ultimo in continuation of previous correspondence on the subject of the purchase of estates by the Congested Districts Board, I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to state, for the Board's information, that a further letter has now been received from the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, in which Their Lordships explain that They considered it probable that the Estimates for 1907-8 would require some modification in the light of further knowledge as to the rate of progress in the improvement and re-sale of land which would be gained during the year.

Their Lordships also point out that since the Estimates were submitted your Board have been given authority to turn their attention to negotiations for the purchase of grazing lands (Treasury letter of 29th August last, communicated to the Board by letter from this office of 2nd September); and Their Lordships think it desirable, before considering the Estimates further, to await the report asked for in the second paragraph of that letter, in order that the financial position may be more clearly defined.

Their Lordships further point out that the Board's statutory income has been fixed by Parliament at a total of £86,250 under the Acts 54 and 55 Vict., cap. 48, sect. 35, 62 and 63 Vict., cap. 18, sect 5, and 3 Edw. VII., cap 37, sect. 38, and they conceive that they have no power, without further legislation, to increase that income. They feel, therefore, bound, in considering the annual Estimates submitted by the Board, to see that the proposed expenditure does not exceed the income available.

Their Lordships, therefore, remain of opinion that the Board's purchases should continue to be regulated by the extent of the resources at their disposal; but, provided that this limitation is kept in view, they see no reason why negotiations for the purchase of further properties should not be carried on, subject to the understanding that purchases could only be completed as the necessary funds for improvement, &c., become available.

Their Lordships also express the opinion that, in view of the present difficult conditions under which money is raised for the Irish Land Purchase Fund, involving such serious demands upon the Guarantee Fund, and ultimately on the Irish ratepayers, no steps should be taken which would have the effect of accelerating advances beyond the rate which is absolutely unavoidable.

I am,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
J. B. DOUGHERTY.

The Secretary,
Congested Districts Board.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V.

Letter No. 16.

Memorandum sent by direction of the Congested Districts Board to the Chief Secretary.

Board's Funds, 1907-8.

At the meeting of the Congested Districts Board on the 8th November—the Chief Secretary being in the chair—the necessity of revising the year's Estimates and of providing further funds was under consideration. The Secretary was directed to prepare a Revised Estimate for the Treasury in readiness for the next meeting, fixed for the 13th December.

The financial statement submitted showed that the receipts from the re-sale of estates had since 1st April last amounted to only £34,000 out of a total of £158,000 in the year's Estimates, which included (*a*) £35,000, the "enhanced value" on sales amounting to £658,498 of estates purchased under the Land Act of 1903, and (*b*) £123,000 receivable in cash for the balance of estates purchased before the passing of that Act.

It has not, however, been found possible, up to the present date, to make final arrangements for the sale of more than £200,000 worth of holdings in class (*a*), and, although almost all the estates in class (*b*) are ready for sale, £48,000 of agreements remain to be signed by the tenants.

The result is that it seems very probable that the £35,000 will not be obtained in cash until after 31st March next, and that a considerable portion, perhaps three-fourths of the £48,000, may be in the same position, as it cannot be at present ascertained when these agreements will be fiated. There may be a maximum deficiency of £71,000.

The Estimate for 1907-8 provides for the repayment of £50,000 principal to the Board of Works, including £46,000 borrowed under the former Treasury Regulations, under which the Board were not compelled to repay when an estate was completely sold, the entire sum borrowed for that estate. If this amount, £46,000, be retained until after 31st March next the probable cash deficiency on the current year will be £25,000, and unless the Board are enabled to borrow about £25,000 they will have to suspend operations on their estates

The stoppage of the improvement works in the middle of the winter months, when all the people are at home, and in a bad season, would be disastrous both to the Board's usefulness and to the peace of the many districts, in all the congested counties, which would be affected.

The Board think it right to mention the fact that two years have elapsed since they drew attention to the necessity of more funds to enable them to make better progress with migration and the enlargement of holdings, and in each of the past two years the works on their estates have been partially suspended for want of funds—the Board having under the Treasury Rules to provide one-third of the expenditure on improvements out of their own funds, and as the amount of land in hands has increased in spite of the reduced amount purchased in each year, the lack of funds has been severely felt.

In the Board's letter of 15th April last, addressed to the Under Secretary, forwarding their Estimates for the present year, they stated as follows:—

"The Board intend to proceed as far as possible with the preparation of the estates for sale, but they cannot *even on the favourable view* of the probable re-sales which has been taken in the Estimate, and after borrowing the full amount that the regulations permit, provide for more than 70 per cent. of the required expenditure on improvements they desire to carry out in the year, and at its close their liabilities in respect of estates will exceed the assets by about £32,000."

F. W. D. MITCHELL,
Secretary,

23 Rutland Square, Dublin.
28*th November*, 1907.

Letter No. 17.

DUBLIN CASTLE,
16*th December*, 1907.

SIR,

With reference to the discussion at the meeting of the Congested Districts Board on the 8th ultimo relative to their funds, I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit, for the information of the Board, copy of a letter from the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury on the subject.

I am,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
J. B. DOUGHERTY.

The Secretary,
Congested Districts Board,
Dublin.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Enclosure in Letter No. 17.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,
13th December, 1907.

SIR,

I have laid before the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury Sir J. Dougherty's letter of the 4th instant (No. 26871), in which His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant recommends an application from the Congested Districts Board for a loan of £25,000 in order to meet the cost of improvement works, which will not be covered by other receipts of the Board

It is explained that, in addition to the sum of £47,000 proposed to be horrowed from the Board of Works in respect of improvements, the estimated receipts of the Board contained items of—

(*b*) Resale of estates under Land Act, 1896 Amount of advances paid to Board hy Land Commission under Treasury Rule 26 (1), including refund of Sinking Fund, £123,000.

(*a*) Resale of estates under Land Act, 1903 Payments hy Land Commission under Section 72 (3) and Treasury Rule 28, £35,000 Total £158,000, which would have heen applicahle to works of improvement hut that the amount expected to be realised in respect of these items within the financial year is—

(*a*) Nil.

(*b*) £87,000, leaving an estimated total deficit of £71,000 The failure to realise this sum is apparently due to delay in concluding the arrangements with tenant purchasers, and appears to have no connection with the alleged insufficiency of the Board's income, to which the Memorandum of the Board alludes.

My Lords do not know as regards item (*a*) why, if final arrangements have been made for the sale of £200,000 worth of estates, or nearly a third of the £658,498, purchases under the Act of 1903, no part of the £35,000 should be received during the year

As regards the proposal of the Board to horrow £25,000, I am to say that My Lords are not aware of any source from which such a loan could be made, as They do not regard the power to horrow from the Local Loans Fund under section 40 (6) of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, as applicahle to the circumstances, the application of the Board being practically one to overspend its income during the year by the amount of the suggested loan

In Their Lordships' opinion the only remedy is for the Board to confine its expenditure within its availahle income If this is not done, and if the Comptroller and Auditor-General should report to this effect on the accounts of the Board, the responsihility of defending before the Public Accounts Committee the action taken will rest exclusively upon the Irish Government and the Board

I am, etc.,

G. H. MURRAY

The Under Secretary,
Duhlin Castle.

Letter No. 18.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD FOR IRELAND,
23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,
31st December, 1907

SIR,

I am directed hy the Congested Districts Board to state that they had under consideration to-day the Treasury letter, dated 13th instant, relative to their funds, forwarded with your letter of 16th instant While the Board agree that it is very unfortunate that their anticipations in regard to the re-sale of their estates have not been realised, they desire to point out that the conclusion of arrangements with tenant-purchasers is only postponed, and that the money they expected to have realised on re-sales will come in during the next year In the meantime the only way in which the Board could comply with the advice given in the Treasury letter to confine its expenditure within its available income would he hy stopping immediately all improvement works on their estates. I am to point out, however, that if the improvement works were stopped the preparation of estates for re-sale would he delayed a year, as little work could he done during the summer This delay would affect all the estates now in hands, and would disarrange the Board's finances for the ensuing and possibly later years It would also directly conduce to unrest on the estates, as tenants would resent being retained in the position of tenants for the time the outlay would entail.

Under these circumstances I am directed to again request that the urgent necessity of the issue of a loan of £25,000 from some source may be represented to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury; otherwise the improvement works must he closed on the 15th January.

I have the honour, &c.,

F. W. D MITCHELL.

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V.

Letter No. 19.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,

WHITEHALL, S.W.,

4th January, 1908.

DEAR SIR ANTONY,

I have been considering the question which you mentioned when you were here a few days before Christmas—namely, whether there is any way of helping the Congested Districts Board out of the financial difficulties into which they have got through following the course which (I must say) we have always protested against—namely, trying to do too much at once, and consequently not being able to pay their way.

I have also got your official letter of 2nd instant submitting the question of a loan for reconsideration. I am afraid, however, that it does not contain anything which will help us to do what is asked.

We are bound by the Act of 1891 (which makes the Board's Estimates subject to our control) to see that their transactions are kept within their resources, and we have therefore been obliged to withhold approval of the Estimates for 1907-8 until it is shown how they can be balanced. No attempt has been made to do this, and I think I ought to say at once that if we are to help the Board, the Board must conform to the directions of the Act of 1891, submit their Estimates to us in such form as we can approve, and confine their proceedings within such approved Estimates.

The first thing therefore that we shall have to ask for is a *revised* Estimate of the Income and Expenditure of the Board for 1907-8, accompanied by a statement showing (*a*) the price of Estates already bought this year, (*b*) the probable purchases in the course of the year, and (*c*) the position as regards estimated amount of improvement money which will remain to be spent in 1908-9 and future years on estates still in hand on 31st March, 1907, and how it is proposed to provide for it.

In the next place we should like a clear declaration from the Irish Government that, if we came to the aid of the Board, you will insist with them that, unless and until their income is increased, they shall enter into no new transactions until they have balanced their income and expenditure, and shown that they will again have income available for the purpose of taking in hand other estates, so that the present position shall not recur.

In this connection let me remind you of two things. The Board told us on 15th October, 1906, that they had decided that they would not, until the result of the Royal Commission on Congestion has been announced, purchase further lands, except such as may be specially suitable for their purposes, and they estimated that £50,000 will cover such special cases. Have the Board adhered to this pledge?

Again I may refer to the Board's letter of *9th October*, 1905, in which they told us they anticipated that all the estates bought before the passing of the Act of 1903 would be sold before the end of 1905-6, or early in the following year, and that the Board were then ready to prepare for sale the properties bought under the new Act. Yet the Board's memorandum of *28th November*, 1907, said that there was still £35,000 for enhanced value and £123,000 receivable in cash for the balance of estates purchased before the passing of the Act of 1903. I cannot understand this discrepancy between the two statements. I mention it because it will give you some idea of the difficulties we feel in dealing with proposals from the Board.

I come now to the possible method (if any) in which the Treasury can assist you. We have, as we stated in our reply to you, and as I told you when you were here, no fund from which we could make a loan; nor have the Land Commission any power to advance you money before it can be paid under the Rules under the Act of 1903. The only possibility therefore is by a loan from the Board of Works under the system which allows the Congested Districts Board to borrow for improvements. And here I may refer to the Treasury letter of 28th February, 1906, in which we made you an offer in those terms —

"My Lords have a further suggestion to make which they hope will convince His Excellency that, so far from wishing to interpose unnecessary difficulties in the exercise by the Congested Districts Board of its legitimate functions, they are anxious to help them to the utmost extent compatible with the principle above contended for. At present it is the rule that one-third of the money spent upon improvements must be found out of the Congested Districts Board's own income, and only two-thirds borrowed from the Board of Works. If His Excellency and the Congested Districts Board would agree that, along with the Board's Estimates for any year, there should be submitted to the Treasury an estimate of the maximum amount to be asked for (subject to its being possible to allocate that amount out of the Irish Land Purchase Fund) for the purchase by the Board of estates or untenanted land in the year, and that this estimate, like the Board's Estimates of income and expenditure, when once approved by the Treasury, should not be exceeded without the sanction of My Lords, they would be prepared to withdraw the condition as to the expenditure of one-third of the improvement money out of the Board's own funds, and to allow the whole of the recoverable expenditure on such improvement work, as those for which the Board of Works could lend to other borrowers under the Land Improvement Acts, to be borrowed from that Board. It is clear that this arrangement would set free considerable sums otherwise chargeable on the Congested Districts Board's own funds, which could then be applied to the other purposes of purchasing tenants' interests, tenant purchasers' farms, etc., and of meeting losses."

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

This offer was in our judgment a reasonable one, and the conditions were obviously the only conditions that could secure the effective carrying out of the financial provisions in the Act of 1891. No notice appears to have been taken of this offer But it is still open if the Irish Government will give us such an undertaking as we asked for in the passage I have quoted: and it seems to me to indicate the only means by which we could assist you out of your present difficulties.

But there are further conditions which I think would be desirable both in the interests of the Board and the Treasury. It seems to us that all the difficulties of the Board are due to trying to do too much at once, *i.e.*, spreading improvements over too many estates at the same time, and so keeping them *all* an unreasonable time in hand. I think therefore that it should be a condition that any money which can now be made available should be spent on a *few* estates only, with a view to getting them resold quickly, and that the loan should be repaid in 1908-9 out of the proceeds of sale.

I shall be glad to know whether you can see your way to meet us in the manner which I have indicated In that case the Treasury would, I think, be prepared to enlarge your borrowing powers from the Board of Works, so as to relieve your present difficulties

Very truly yours,

G H. MURRAY.

Letter No. 20.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD,
23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,
13*th January*, 1908

SIR,

I am directed by the Congested Districts Board to state that at their meeting on the 10th instant they had before them a semi-official letter addressed by Sir George Murray to Sir Antony MacDonnell on the subject of the Board's application for a special loan of £25,000, and in reply I am to state as follows —

I A Revised Estimate for the current year was prepared last month, but was withheld pending the decision of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury as to the loan above mentioned. This Estimate is now enclosed.

II. (*a*) The price of estates already agreed to be bought this year is £98,485. The Board, in deference to the views expressed by Their Lordships, have decided to purchase no more tenanted estates this year, but they have to report that acting with the special sanction of the Treasury, they have made offers for £94,700 to owners of grass lands in County Roscommon, and they now request authority to negotiate for further grass lands to the extent of £100,000.

(*b*) Including these three items, the probable purchases which may be made in the current year would amount to £293,185. In connection with the total prices of tenanted estates agreed upon in the past and the present financial years, the Board desire to explain that in their letter of the 15th October, 1906, in reference to the Estimates for 1906-7, they proposed to purchase £234,764 worth of estates, including the £50,000 mentioned in Sir George Murray's letter. The amount actually agreed upon in that year was £108,219, and adding £98,485 for purchases already concluded in 1907-8, the total is £206,704, against £234,764, mentioned on 15th October, 1906. The Board have therefore adhered to the pledge given in that letter The arrangements for purchase of grass lands were subsequently sanctioned

It was contemplated by the 74th Section of Land Act of 1903 that the Board might have in their hands at one time a maximum of £1,237,500 worth of untenanted land, but at present, after the Act has been in operation four years, they have only £326,700 worth of untenanted land vested in them and unsold

(*c*) The amount of improvement money which will remain to be spent in 1908-9 and future years on estates in hand on 31st March, 1908, including the purchase of tenants' interests, will be about £120,000 Deducting £37,000 recoverable on the resale of the remaining holdings on the 1896 Act group of estates, there will remain £83,000 which can be provided out of the Board's existing funds by spreading the expenditure over four, or, at the outside, five years, and exercising economy in other schemes.

III The expectation expressed by the Board in their letter of 9th October, 1905, that the older estates would be completely sold in 1905-6 or early in the following year has not been realised owing to various unforeseen circumstances, viz

(1) Several estates have been retained until untenanted land could be purchased for enlarging the holdings (Vesey Stoney, Dillon, Darcy, Lucan, etc.)

(2) Holdings in towns were retained while there was a possibility of the position of sub-tenants being improved by the Town Tenants Act.

(3) Local opposition to migrants has prevented the sale of several farms

(4) Some tenants objected to the Board's terms, and refused to buy

(5) Difficulty in clearing title from intervening interests.

The balance receivable from these old estates was then estimated at £123,000 The further sum of £35,000 mentioned in Sir George Murray's letter was for estates bought under the Act of 1903.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V.

IV. The offer made by the Treasury in their letter of 28th February, 1906, that if the Board would agree to limit their purchases to a definite figure each year the Treasury "would allow them to borrow the whole cost of recoverable improvement works," was not accepted by the Board, as it would not have been of any advantage to them, inasmuch as they already had power to borrow up to the amount of the recoverable expenditure, that is, the "enhanced value," which, as a general rule, represents only one-third of the expenditure on improvements.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D. MITCHELL.

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

Letter No. 21.

DUBLIN CASTLE,

Immediate. *7th February*, 1908.

SIR,

With reference to previous correspondence on the subject of the application of the Congested Districts Board for a special loan of £25,000, I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit, to be laid before the Board, a copy of a further letter from the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury on the subject, and I am to suggest that the letter is one calling for the earliest attention possible.

I am,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. J. CULLINAN.

The Secretary,
Congested Districts Board.

Enclosure in Letter No. 21.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,

6th February, 1908.

SIR,

With reference to your further letter (789) of 14th ultimo and its enclosures on the subject of the request of the Congested Districts Board for a temporary loan of £25,000, I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury to request you to inform His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant that the only method which they consider open to them of assisting the Board would be by an advance from the Civil Contingencies Fund to be repaid within a short time.

But before the advance of the sum of £25,000, if so much were available, or any less sum can be sanctioned, it is necessary that My Lords should have further information and further assurances on certain points. My Lords must in the first place ask for (1) a statement showing the actual income and expenditure of the Board from 1st April, 1907, to the most recent date to which the accounts can be made up, say, if possible, the 1st instant, (2) an estimate of the further sums (*a*) to be received, (*b*) required for expenditure under all the heads in the Estimates up to 31st March, 1908; (3) an undertaking by the Congested Districts Board that the £25,000 or any less sum advanced will be repaid within the first three months of the financial year 1908-9 with a statement showing out of what specific sums to be received from the Land Commission or otherwise before 30th June, 1908, the advance will be repaid, or what arrangement will be made to earmark so much of the said specific receipts as may be required, so that repayment within the time mentioned will actually be secured.

In addition to the above requirements it will be necessary that My Lords should be satisfied that the present temporary emergency which it is proposed to meet by the suggested advance will not recur, but that the Board will be able to balance their income and expenditure for 1908-9 without asking for further assistance of the kind. My Lords must therefore ask for a forecast of the income and expenditure of the Board for 1908-9 showing that this will be the case, and for an undertaking by the Board that they will keep within the figures to be submitted

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

As regards the Revised Estimates, 1907-8, enclosed in your letter, My Lords observe a reduction in expenditure as compared with the original Estimates of £14,000 on account of the purchase of tenants' interests (which is, however, only postponed), but beyond this, notwithstanding the immediate pressure and difficulty as to finding funds for expenditure on improvements, they do not find evidence of any endeavour to curtail expenditure in other directions to any material extent, except indeed by postponing the repayment of large sums due to the Board of Works. On the other hand, Their Lordships observe that the Congested Districts Board have found it possible to insert such items as £2,930 for "the purchase of two Motor Cars, &c.," and £2,500 for a Steam Drifter.

I am,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

G H MURRAY

Letter No. 22.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD,

23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,

18*th February*, 1908.

SIR,

With reference to Sir Frederic Cullinan's letter of 7th instant, enclosing copy of a letter from The Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, dated 6th February, I am directed by the Congested Districts Board to state that the reason why the Board are under the necessity of applying to the Treasury for this advance of £25,000 is the disappointment of their expectation of receiving from the Land Commission £123,000, payable in respect of agreements concerning the estates purchased before the Act of 1903. Agreements covering only £76,000 out of the £123,000 have as yet been deposited with the Land Commission, and the Board expect to receive the whole of the £76,000 before the 31st March. There remains over a balance of £47,000, in respect of which the Board confidently hope that agreements covering £30,000 will be lodged before the 1st June next, and the payment of this £30,000 to the Board will then only depend on the vesting proceedings of the Land Commission. This sum of £30,000 can be earmarked to pay off the advance of £25,000 which the Board ask for from the Treasury. The Board, however, trust that the Treasury will permit this advance to be paid off by instalments, as in the case of other loans. Otherwise their difficulties in the way of preparing a budget for next year, already very great, will be magnified.

The returns called for by Their Lordships are enclosed herewith. They show that the sum provided for the improvement of estates for the year 1908-9 can be no more from the Board's existing means than £25,000, a sum of which is only procured by making no provision for the Parish Committee Works (which the Board regard as a disaster), and by reducing Fisheries, Industries, and Engineering Works to their lowest possible figure. As the income during the first six months will be absorbed by fixed charges, the works for the Improvement of Estates must be suspended from the 1st April next until further funds are obtained.

At least £85,000 will be required if the improvement of the estates now in hand is to be continued, and the Board is to fulfil the functions it was created to discharge. The Estimate shows that to provide this sum an additional grant of at least £60,000 must be placed on the Votes for next year.

With regard to the payments to the Board of Works referred to in the Treasury letter, I am to state that the Congested Districts Board have paid to the Commissioners of Public Works all that has become due under the deeds by which money has been borrowed.

I am to add that the two motors mentioned cost together £800, not £2,900, and that the purchase was decided upon in June last before the necessity for retrenchment became known.

The Board desire to refer to their letter of the 8th October, 1905, in which they stated that unless their income were increased their estates operations must be reduced to a merely nominal figure.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D. MITCHELL.

The Under Secretary,

Dublin Castle.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

APPENDIX V.

Letter No. 23.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,

5th March, 1908.

SIR,

I have laid before the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury Sir J. Dougherty's letter of the 19th ultimo, further respecting the application of the Congested Districts Board for a temporary loan of £25,000.

My Lords observe that the Board express their readiness to pay off the proposed advance out of a sum of £30,000, which they expect to receive early in next financial year in respect of the resale of Estates purchased prior to the Irish Land Act, 1903; but they ask that, in order to provide for Improvement Expenditure in 1908–9, estimated at £85,000, an additional grant of "at least £60,000" be placed on Votes of Parliament for next year.

In reply I am to state that my Lords cannot now consider the provision of any additional funds in excess of their statutory income for 1908–9 being placed at the disposal of the Board, having regard to the fact that the Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland has not yet reported; and I am to request you to remind His Excellency that an intimation to this effect was conveyed to the Irish Government in their Lordships' letter of the 28th February, 1906, and repeated in their letter of the 19th June, 1906. It cannot therefore be suggested that the Congested Districts Board were not made aware of their position in this respect.

The Board have also been repeatedly warned that their expenditure must be restricted within the limit assigned to them by Parliament, and very serious responsibility will rest upon them if this elementary obligation is neglected.

I am further to point out that the estimates of the Board's expenditure for the current year have not yet been approved by my Lords, and that by section 40 (6) of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, the Board are precluded from spending any money except after such approval. In these circumstances it is clear that the whole of the Board's expenditure during the current year (which has already involved them in a deficit) has been incurred without proper authority. My Lords think that, as the Comptroller and Auditor-General will undoubtedly draw the attention of the House of Commons to this state of things, the Irish Government should ascertain forthwith on whom the responsibility rests for the irregularities which have been committed.

As regards the remainder of the current year, I am to state that, before my Lords can sanction any further advances to meet current expenditure, they must ask for a definite statement of the commitments and liabilities of the Board to the 31st instant, showing what expenditure is optional and what is absolutely necessary, with full details as to the precise purposes for which it is being incurred. They observe that, although the Board have asked for a temporary advance of £25,000, the accounts transmitted with your letter of the 19th ultimo show a balance, after allowing for the advance, of about £11,600 carried forward to 1908–9.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

G. H. MURRAY.

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

Letter No. 24.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD,

23 RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,

13th March, 1908.

SIR,

I am directed by the Congested Districts Board to state that the letter of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury dated 5th instant, forwarded to them by the Under Secretary, was read at their meeting to-day.

The Board regret that their Lordships decline to consider the provision of any additional funds for the coming financial year and in this connection they desire to refer to Mr. George Wyndham's Memorandum dated 4th July, 1902, printed at page 336 of the Appendix of the First Report of the Royal Commission on Congestion, from which it will be seen that the Treasury then agreed to an increase of the Board's income in advance of legislation.

If the Board did not expend on improvement works on their estates their expected balance, including economies recently effected under great pressure, the improvement works should be practically discontinued at the beginning of April The economies effected are as follows:—

Estate Improvements,	£10,000
Technical Instruction (Lace Classes)	1,000
Industries, Grants,	1,000
Piers and Roads,	1,000

The balance shown in the revised estimate which includes £3,000 carried over for Parish Committee Grants promised last summer, would not be available at the end of this financial year did the Board not calculate upon receiving the full loan of £25,000. That loan will enable them to carry on their improvement works, though on a contracted scale, during the current financial year. At the end of the current financial year a practical suspension of their works will be necessary, and no works can be undertaken after 31st May, as is manifest from the revised estimate for 1908–9 (now submitted) which shows that a sum of only £18,000 can be provided under this head, after effecting economies in all branches of their expenditure except in regard to their establishment. Having considered the question of their establishment they have come to the conclusion that it would be highly inexpedient in the public interest to reduce at this stage an

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

establishment which has been brought to its present level for the purpose of enabling the Board to fulfil the duties imposed upon them by the Act of 1903.

The Board's purchases of land during the past four years have been :—

In 1904–5	£649,544
,, 1905–6	£346,706
,, 1906–7	£108,861
,, 1907–8	£125,885

The rapid reduction here shown has been due to the want of the increased funds asked for by the Board in 1905, while a great expansion of their operations was clearly contemplated in the Act of 1903, which provided that they might hold at one time as much as £1,237,500 worth of untenanted land.

With regard to the excess of expenditure over receipts in the current year the Board beg to point out that they expressed their readiness early in December last to effect immediate economies if the loan then applied for could not be issued. Two sources from which the Board could obtain such an advance are indicated in the Land Purchase Act of 1891. As the Board were not informed that the loan would not be issued they allowed the expenditure to continue, but cannot admit that in these circumstances they are responsible for the difficulty which has arisen since December last.

The enclosed statement shows that in past years the Board's Estimates have never been approved by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury until after a portion of the year, and in one case a whole year, had elapsed and the expenditure had frequently gone on for several months before the approval of the Estimates was notified to the Board. No objection has been made to this expenditure either by Their Lordships or by the Comptroller and Auditor-General.

No grants to Parish Committees have been provided for in the Estimates for next year, but as about £3,000 promised to these Committees for the current year cannot be paid until after 1st April, 1908, this sum should be carried over in the Board's balance and paid to these Committees early in the coming year, when their accounts are vouched.

The balance of £11,000, referred to by the Treasury, does not exceed the Board's normal requirements at the beginning of a new year, and great difficulty was experienced in carrying on the business last year with a balance of only £4,430.

The statements called for by the Treasury are forwarded herewith.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D. MITCHELL

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

STATEMENT showing Dates on which the Board's Estimates were forwarded, and the Dates on which they were approved by the Treasury.

Year.	Date when Submitted.	Date when Approved.
1892–3,	12th March, 1892,	8th April, 1892.
1893–4,	18th May, 1893,	15th June, 1893.
1894–5,	6th March, 1894, 20th April, 1894,	11th May, 1894.
1895–6,	14th March, 1895,	2nd April, 1895
1896–7,	26th March, 1896, 28th May, 1896,	23rd April, 1896. 17th June, 1896.
1897–8,	24th March, 1897,	5th May, 1897.
1898–9,	26th March, 1898, 26th May, 1898,	23rd July, 1898.
1899–1900,	16th March, 1899,	8th May, 1899.
1900–1,	3rd March, 1900, 16th March, 1901,	19th April, 1901. (Not approved in the year).
1901–2,	26th March, 1901,	4th May, 1901.
1902–3,	24th April, 1902,	7th June, 1902.
1903–4,	25th March, 1903,	22nd April, 1903.
1904–5,	29th March, 1904,	23rd May, 1904.
1905–6,	16th March, 1905,	8th August, 1905.
1906–7,	30th April, 1906,	24th October, 1906.
1907–8,	15th April, 1907,	(Not yet sanctioned).

In 13 of the years 23 Revised Estimates were furnished at various dates during the year

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Letter No. 25.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,
18th March, 1908.

SIR,

I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, to acknowledge the receipt of Sir J. Dougherty's letter (5566), dated 14th instant, but received here late in the afternoon of yesterday, the 17th instant, transmitting, by direction of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, a copy of a letter dated 13th instant, with enclosures from the Congested Districts Board

My Lords think it unnecessary to reply at length to the Board's letter, but there are certain statements in it which they cannot allow to pass without immediate comment.

1. The Board state that they expressed their readiness early in December last, to effect immediate economies, if the loan then applied for could not be granted.

The Board's memorandum, enclosed in Sir J. Dougherty's letter of 4th December, is apparently, here referred to, but My Lords find in it nothing that they could interpret in this way The terms of the memorandum suggested the very contrary, the paragraphs on the subject running as follows :—

> "The stoppage of the improvement works in the middle of the winter months, when all the people are at home, and in a bad season, would be disastrous, both to the Board's usefulness, and to the peace of the many districts, in all the congested counties, which would be affected."

2. The Board state that, as they were not informed that the loan would not be issued, they allowed the expenditure to continue, but cannot admit that in these circumstances, they are responsible for the difficulty which has arisen since December last.

As a matter of fact, the Treasury letter of 13th December to the Irish Government did state that My Lords could not sanction a loan, and that, in Their Lordships' opinion, the only remedy was for the Board to confine their expenditure within their available income.

3. The Board give a list of dates showing how long a time was spent in correspondence in previous years before their Estimates were approved.

The argument sought to be based thereon is irrelevant, because the Estimates for 1907-8 were the first, so far as My Lords are aware, which showed a large excess of liabilities over assets. This made it necessary for My Lords definitely to refuse sanction to those Estimates until the Board showed how they could balance their accounts. The Treasury letter refusing to sanction the Estimates was dated 17th May, 1907, so that the Board had full warning, and every opportunity of satisfying Their Lordships' requirements had they seen fit.

I am, &c.,
G. H. MURRAY.

THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Dublin Castle.

Letter No. 26.

TREASURY CHAMBERS,
4th April, 1908.

SIR,

The Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have had under further consideration Sir J. Dougherty's letter (5566) of the 14th ultimo, enclosing copy of a letter from the Congested Districts Board, dated 13th ult., with the Board's revised Estimates for the year 1908–9.

It will be in the recollection of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant that the Board had already submitted in their letter of 18th February (enclosed in Sir J. Dougherty's letter of 19th February), an approximate estimate of their income and expenditure for 1908–9, upon which the Board stated that on the assumption of an advance of £25,000 being made to the Board in 1907–8 and repaid in 1908–9, they would require an additional grant of £60,000, in order to make the Estimates for 1908–9 balance.

The Board having been informed that My Lords could not consider the provision of any funds in excess of their statutory income for 1908–9, having regard to the fact that the Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland had not reported, it became necessary for the Board to revise its Estimates for 1908–9, in such a way as to avoid the deficit of £60,000. It would seem that among so many different items of expenditure as are included in the Estimates it should have been possible to make reductions in a number of directions. Yet, My Lords find that the whole £60,000 and £7,000 besides, has been taken off the item of Improvement Works, no other items showing a reduction except that for Technical Instruction (£830), and two others actually showing increases of £3,000 and £2,901 respectively.

The effect of the particular method chosen by the Board of making the necessary reductions is plain ; it is, indeed, indicated in the fourth paragraph of the Board's letter of 13th March stating that "no works can be undertaken after 31st May."

It is not the province of this Board to suggest the items on which reductions should be made in order to find money for improvement works, but My Lords desire to make it clear that they can accept no responsibility for any stoppage of works consequent on the Board's choosing to restrict the provision for them to £18,000, or any particular figure. If, therefore, My Lords approve of the Estimates for 1908–9, it can only be on the understanding that the responsibility rests entirely upon the Board.

As the suggested advance of £25,000 was not made in 1907–8, but only £3,000 was advanced from the Civil Contingencies Fund, the Estimates for 1908–9 need only provide for the repayment of this £3,000 instead of £25,000. On the other hand, the balance in hand on 1st April, 1908,

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

will, presumably, for the same reason, be different from the £12,866 for which credit is taken in the Estimates now under consideration.

Before approving those Estimates, My Lords would be glad to be informed (1) what was the actual balance in hand on 1st instant; (2) whether the Board desire, with reference to what has been said above, to alter the Estimates in any other respects.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

G. H. MURRAY.

THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Dublin Castle.

Letter No 27.

23, RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,
15th April, 1908.

SIR,

With reference to the letters from the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, dated 18th ultimo and 4th instant, respecting the funds of the Congested Districts Board, I am directed by the Board to state that they greatly regret that there should have been any misunderstanding in regard to their application for a loan of £25,000. They desire to assure the Lords Commissioners that while it was their earnest wish to continue the improvement works if funds were obtainable, they were quite prepared to close them as early as the 15th January last if they had clearly understood that the loan could not be issued.

In their memorandum of 28th November last they stated that "unless the Board are enabled to borrow about £25,000 they will have to suspend operation on their estates," and on 31st December, they stated, in reply to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, that "the only way in which the Board could comply with the advice given in the Treasury letter, to confine its expenditure within its available income, would be by stopping immediately all improvement works on their estate," and in the same letter again drew attention to the urgent necessity of this loan, and added that "otherwise the improvement works must be closed on 15th January." On the 15th January the Board submitted a Revised Estimate for the year and included the proposed loan in the receipts as they did not understand that it had been refused. Even as late as the beginning of February they were ready to close the works, and would have done so if instructions to the contrary had not been given by the Chief Secretary on the 8th of that month.

The sum of £3,000, lodged to their credit from Civil Contingencies on 12th February, was accepted as an instalment of the loan and the full amount £25,000, was therefore again inserted in a Revised Estimate submitted on 13th March. In order to prevent their account being overdrawn on 31st March the Board after reducing their expenditure on estates by £10,000 had to postpone payments amounting to £7,000. By this means they closed the year with a balance of £3,500.

With regard to the Statement of Assets and Liabilities referred to in Their Lordships' letter of 17th May, the Board replied fully on 17th June, but did not gather either from the letter of 17th May, or the following letter of 29th August, that Their Lordships called for a Revised Estimate

In connection with the revision of the Estimates for the current year, I am to explain that the £3,000 mentioned in Their Lordships' letter of 4th instant, is as stated in the Board's last letter, a sum due to the Parish Committees, as part of the grants promised to them last summer, but omitted from the first Estimate owing to a misunderstanding. There is always an arrear in the payment of these grants. £2,901 for Fisheries is not a net increase; the Estimate shows that it is more than counterbalanced by the increased receipts under the same head

Their Lordships are under a misapprehension as to there being other heads of expenditure which might have been reduced The Board had, as stated in their letter of 18th February, reduced all charges to the sums to which they were committed, and further economy could only be effected by closing the lace classes or dismissing the staff The item of £17,000 for tenants' interests is the sum which the Board must pay in order to carry out the re-sales of the estates now in hand.

The Board have considered the question of selling their steamer, the *Granuaile* The vessel is very useful to the fisheries and the estates belonging to the Board on the west coast, as well as for maintaining communication with the islands. The Board have also reason to believe, that if this vessel were sold, the Department of Agriculture would find it necessary to purchase a second steamer for the prevention of illegal trawling, a duty for which the *Granuaile* is now available.

The adjustments caused by the non-receipt of the balance of the loan of £25,000 have been made on the enclosed Revised Estimate. It has, however, been found impossible to provide more than £33,000 for improvement works during the entire year unless the staff be reduced.

Since the close of the past year the estate accounts have been re-examined and it has been found possible to borrow £20,000 instead of £10,000, as proposed in the previous Estimate. All the estates which have been vested in the Board and on which any money can be borrowed have now been included.

The estimated receipts from re sale of the older estates has been reduced £10,000 owing to further delay in the re-settlement of the O'Grady Leasehold on the Dillon Estate, purchased by the Board last year, and owing to £2,700 for re-sales having come to credit in March instead of in the new year.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

F. W. D. MITCHELL.

THE UNDER SECRETARY
Dublin Castle.

DUBLIN: Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office,
By ALEX THOM & Co (Limited), 87, 88, & 89 Abbey-street

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Parliamentary Commission

[illegible 3806] Spain [illegible] 1907 [illegible]

[illegible 70, 3889] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible 7] Navigation [illegible] 1902. [illegible]

[illegible 9.] British [illegible]

[illegible 03.] Colonial [illegible] 2s. 3d.

[illegible 41] Strikes and [illegible] 8d.

[illegible 3] Changes [illegible] 9d.

[illegible 8.] Voluntary [illegible] Boards and Joint Committees. Report on Rules of. 1s. 4d.

[illegible] Foreign Import [illegible] 3s.

[illegible 867.] British Trade in New [illegible] Conditions and Prospects. Report. 2d.

[illegible 3868] British Trade in Canada. Conditions and Prospects. Report. 1s. 5d.

Record Office Publications :—

I. Calendars —

Close Rolls. Edward III. Vol. X. 1354–1360. 15s.

Military :—

Accountants and Officers Commanding Units, &c. Instructions for the Guidance of. Nov. 1907 2d.

Artillery. Royal Garrison. Instructions for Practice Seaward, 1908–9. 3d.

Examinations —

Officers of Regular Forces, Canadian Permanent Forces, Militia, Imperial Yeomanry, and Volunteer. Nov. 1907 1s.

R.M. Academy, Fourth Class, and R.M. College, Senior Division. Dec. 1907 1s.

King's Regulations and Orders for the Army. 1908. 1s. 8d.

Officers' Training Corps. Special Army Order, March 16, 1908. 1d.

Ordnance College. 27th Advanced Class. Report on. 1s.

Do. 16th Ordnance Course. Report on. 1s.

Territorial Force —

Definition of Units for the purposes of the Army Act. Special Army Order, March 31, 1908, enclosing the Royal Warrant dated March 31, 1908. 1d.

Organization and Establishment. Special A.O. March 18, 1908. 6d.

Scheme for the Employment of the Honourable Artillery Company, the Imperial Yeomanry in Great Britain and the Volunteer Force in Ireland in organization with the Territorial Force. Special A.O., March 18, 1908. 2d.

Training. Personnel. 2d.

Transfer of Units to Units. Special Army Order, March 20, 1908, enclosing the Order in Council dated March 19, 1908. 2d.

Admiralty Publications :—

Bay of Bengal Pilot. 1901. Second Supplement, 1908. 6d.

Nautical Almanac and Astronomical Ephemeris for 1911. 2s. 6d.

Do. Part I. Astronomical Tables essential to Navigation. 1s.

Local Government Board :—

Animals. The Humane Slaughtering of. Circular, March 20, 1908. 1d.

Importation of Meat Foods into the United States of America and the Philippine Islands. Declaration and Certificates in connection with the application of the Foods Memorandum, 1908.

Form A. For use where the Meat Foods are prepared, stored, and packed on, and despatched from, one and the same premises. per doz. 6d.

Form B. For use where the Meat Foods are stored and packed on, and despatched for export from premises other than those on which they are prepared. per doz. 1d.

Reports of Inspectors of Foods —

9. Vinegar. Preparation and Sale of. In relation to the Administration of the Sale of Food and Drugs Acts. 4d.

Sanitary Circumstances and Administration of —

Bilston Rural District and Bilbrook in the Township of Bilston. No. 502. 6d.

Lincoln (Parochial). Extract from No. 491. [illegible]

Cases Referred to Local Authorities in connection with Inquiries under the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, and Housing, Town Planning, &c., Acts. 1d.

Emigrants' Information Office, 31 Broadway, Westminster, S.W. —

Colonies, Handbooks for. —

No. 1 Canada. 2 New South Wales. 3 Victoria. 4 South Australia. 5 Queensland. 6 Western Australia. 7 Tasmania. 8 New Zealand. 9 Cape Colony. 10 Natal. 11 Transvaal. 12 Orange River Colony. 1d. each.

No. 13 Professional Handbook. 14 Emigration Statutes and General Handbook. 2d. each.

No. 15 (Nos. 1 to 14 in cloth). 2s.

Intending Emigrants, Information for. —Argentine Republic, 1907. 2d. East Africa Protectorate, 1906. Ceylon, 1907, 1d. Federated Malay States, &c., 1907, 6d. Newfoundland, January, 1908. 1d. Nyasaland Protectorate, September, 1907. 6d. Uganda Protectorate, 1906. 6d. West African Colonies, July, 1907. 6d. West Indies, 1907, 6d.

Summary of Consular Reports, North and South America, 1906. 1d.

Foreign Office :—

Bulletins and other State Papers, 1890. [illegible]

Commercial Treaties between Great Britain and Foreign Powers. Vols. I. to XXIV. 10s. each.

State Papers. British and Foreign. In 95 vols. 10s. each.

Treaties &c. relating to Commerce and Navigation between [illegible] Britain and [illegible] mutually in force, 1 July, 1907. Handbook. [illegible]

Board of Trade :

Collisions at Sea. Regulations [illegible]

Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888. Extracts [illegible]

Journal. Weekly. [illegible]

Labour Gazette. Monthly. [illegible]

Ships coming into Registry, &c. Lists. Monthly. 6d.

Tramways and Light Railways in Public Traffic. [illegible] (Electrical). [illegible]

[illegible 1908.]

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

ROYAL COMMISSION ON CONSCRIPTION IN IRELAND.

APPENDIX

TO THE

ELEVENTH REPORT.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

(TAKEN IN LONDON, 22ND TO 24TH JANUARY, 1908),

AND

DOCUMENTS RELATING THERETO.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.

DUBLIN
PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY ALEXANDER THOM & CO. (LIMITED), ABBEY-STREET.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
E. PONSONBY, 116, Grafton-street, Dublin; or
WYMAN and SONS, Limited, Fetter-lane, E.C.; and
32, Abingdon-street, Westminster, S.W.; or
OLIVER and BOYD, Tweeddale-court, Edinburgh.

1908.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit